



KEIM'S HISTORY
OF
JESUS OF NAZARA.
VOL. VI.

Theol Trans 1883

THE HISTORY
OF
JESUS OF NAZARA,

FREELY INVESTIGATED

IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL LIFE OF ISRAEL,
AND RELATED IN DETAIL.

BY
DR. THEODOR KEIM.

TRANSLATED BY ARTHUR RANSOM.

VOL. VI.



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1883.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
178, STRAND.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

I DEEPLY regret the unavoidable delay that has occurred in completing this translation; but that delay is largely due to the copiousness of the notes and to the general difficulties of the author's style. As I stated in a former note, I have aimed simply at reproducing in readable English every shade of the author's meaning. To have attempted elegance of style would often have necessitated either lengthy paraphrase or the omission of many of the minor clauses in the German sentences. If the work only too frequently reads like a translation, the meaning is, I believe, generally clear. I cannot venture to hope that I have not in any case misunderstood the author; but if I have anywhere failed to render his meaning correctly, it has not been for want of care.

In the fifth volume I asked readers to send me notice of any errors they might detect. Two gentlemen have kindly responded to my appeal; and the few corrections that have been found necessary are given after the Index.

In transferring the notes to this English edition, I have used for reference English translations of the works that have appeared in the same series, so far as those translations were accessible at

the time. The arrangement of the English Authorized Version and Apocrypha has been followed in all Scripture references when it is not otherwise stated.

ARTHUR RANSOM.

BEDFORD, APRIL, 1883.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECOND PART.

	PAGE
THE MESSIANIC DEATH AT JERUSALEM	1
I.—ARREST AND PSEUDO-TRIAL	1
<i>First Hour.</i> Gethsemane	1
<i>Second Hour.</i> Caiaphas and the Nocturnal Trial .	36
<i>Third Hour.</i> Morning Sitting of the Sanhedrim .	63
<i>Fourth Hour.</i> Before Pontius Pilate	79
II.—THE DEATH ON THE CROSS	115
A. The Way to Death	115
1. The Way to the Cross	115
2. Golgotha	132
3. The Peace of Death	166
B. The Day of Death	193
1. The Day	195
2. The Year	219
3. The Feast Calendar	244
III.—BURIAL AND RESURRECTION	250
A. The Lord's Sepulchre	250
B. The Resurrection	274
1. The Facts	281
2. The Resurrection Myths	302
3. The Explanation of the Facts	323
C. The Ascension	365

	PAGE
IV.—THE MESSIAH'S PLACE IN HISTORY . . .	384
A. The Old and the New Confession . . .	384
B. The Testimony of Jesus to Himself . . .	389
C. The Contribution of Jesus to Religion . . .	390
D. The Personal Achievement of Jesus . . .	402
E. The Place of Jesus in History . . .	425

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE LAST VOLUME.

WITH emotions of joy and thankfulness I place the now complete work in the hands of the courteous reader. This thankful joy, qualified only by the reflection that I am bidding farewell to a silent comforter amid the political and religious confusion of which I am a passive witness, will be readily understood by those who have reflected upon the manifold difficulties of such a seven years' labour, and who will therefore acknowledge that joy has a right to take precedence of serious or coquettish regret on account of human imperfections and an unattained ideal. It is only natural that this regret should be felt; yet for my part I do not give expression to it without the consciousness that every possible effort has been put forth even to the overtaking of my strength, and that the history of Jesus has here made an advance which the future will not compel it to retrace. Whilst I have learnt and adopted much from my predecessors, the aim to which I have adhered in my independent contribution to this subject has been determinedly, and with a rejection of all vacillation and accommodation, to base the history of Jesus upon the most ancient sources; to place it on the highway of the development of mankind and of peoples; finally, by copiously connecting it with all the expressions and characteristics of its time, to elevate it as far as possible to such an established complex of facts as science demands, and to such a life-picture of flesh and blood as Christians require. With the historical restoration of this life, a religious reconstruction

has been aimed at. To many, this latter may appear to offer too little building up and too much pulling down; but it is essentially addressed to those who, renouncing what is untenable, desire to hear the unadorned and unmythical truth, to gaze upon the real Jesus of history, and to greet with fervent love Him who still remains actual and imperishable. To show to those to whom the future belongs that Jesus lived, and how his labours added to the dignity and the consolation of mankind—to prove by a hundred evidences that the continually repeated attempt to resolve the life of Jesus into dreamy myths and subtile tendency-poetry utterly fails because of its monstrosities and its naive innocence in all historical questions,—this is the great satisfaction that has accompanied the writer of these lines through life. And should others find that he has done too little or too much, that he has served this subject only relatively or fractionally, or, indeed, only by the provocation of genuine science, these volumes will soon be able to relate that they have at least become to the opponents a welcome quarry of good material for their constructions.

Among the most obnoxious public scourges of the present time, scarcely better than the narrow-minded fanatics of the extreme party in the orthodox camp, must be reckoned the Radical brawlers and enthusiasts. Since, with the previous decade, the happy years of prosperity dawned upon theological liberalism, no conclusion has been far-reaching enough for many persons; everything is distanced, and even they who have hitherto stood isolated at exposed posts and have suffered many things for their honestly candid speech enjoy perpetual summer. Their distinguished opponents, whose achievements in these provinces still remain to be hoped for, take up well-nigh the attitude of Luther against Erasmus or Reuchlin, now giving themselves the airs of erudite historians, advising others to let alone things which only they—the advisers—understand, and now much more justly behaving themselves as inexperienced laymen, who see in historical investigation nothing but an article

of luxury. They find so much pleasure and feel so little pain in demolishing the life of Jesus, that, notwithstanding the feebleness of their powers of independent invention, they would certainly invent the stamping-mill if the miller was not already at their service; and, contrary to all truth, they proclaim aloud to the world how the hope of possessing a concrete life of Jesus is being abandoned by wider and wider circles. How beautifully the machine works: from the compendious abbreviating Mark it has passed to the flowery Mark with his ultimately only artificial bouquets; from the emptied life of Jesus, to the renunciation of the pearls of Christianity—divine providence and eternal life; until nothing stands in the way of what is now found to be the righteous, affecting embrace of religion and the world's wisdom, nothing stands in the way of the introduction of modern culture with its manifold "incitements" into the council-chamber of the Church, though everything—not merely the State, but the religious conscience of the German nation—stands in the way of the victory of a reasonably free Christianity. With more equanimity I see myself continually accompanied by the malicious hissing of these people. Until now I have prized time and rest and peace with every one too highly to offer these people anything but silence. Yet they are not to be shamed by either silence or speech, and they begin afresh if ten times refuted. But when evil has become chronic, when the simple believe everything, and no one protests against the wild manners, then indulgence must have an end; and at last everything, even the clamourer, will be required.

More important is it to me here to meet several serious objections or misunderstandings with the necessary explanations, whilst at the same time I mention with gratitude the more or less friendly notices by Furrer, Heer, Hilgenfeld, Tholuck, Weizsäcker, and Ziegler, as well as the detailed reviews by E. Jaccard and W. Sanday in French and English journals. In the present condition of our sources, no charge lies so near at hand as that of an arbitrary distribution of material; and to no part

of the whole can this censure so easily be directed as to the second, because the first and the third bring with them a much more natural internal cohesion. First of all, it should here not be forgotten that, in consequence of the unfortunate existence of the group system in all our sources, most of all in Matthew, this history has *never* been constructed without new combinations; although it has happened that even learned theologians and recognized critics have felt themselves compelled to ground a reproach upon the breaking up of Matthew's groups. In the next place, it will be taken into consideration that these new combinations have always been based upon two factors: first, upon the indications afforded by the Gospel formations—here Matthew, there Luke and Mark, whose relative worth I have never undervalued; and secondly, upon the indications of history, upon the fundamental features of Jesus's activity which are historically unquestionable, factual, and true to nature. And here I may ask, who can seriously find fault with the regard paid even to the later sources, a regard that is allowed in every province of history; and who has good ground to object to the division of the mission address in Matthew, a division carried out temperately, and in a way that throws light upon the text? Finally, it will be remembered that a distinction between historical certainties and probabilities has always been made according to the condition of our authorities, and that the historical certainties have been exhibited mainly in connection with the general course of this history, and the probabilities with the details. But who will ever be able to hinder a system of scrutiny familiar with old models, or a criticism whose immemorial results are unpleasantly disturbed, from here and there thinking it has registered arbitrary conclusions? Those who lack the ability and the inclination to apply themselves closely to the subject and to think out the views often only suggested in the foot-notes, will be continually taking offence at this and at every scientifically treated history; and if they are honest, they will take offence at earlier representations very

differently than at this. But they who, like Hilgenfeld, would, by a few plausible objections briefly stated, disparage and destroy my "Galilean Spring-time" and "Galilean Storms," and the development of Jesus's life of conflict, have never rightly considered that the joyous harvest-cry of Jesus which introduces the tenth chapter of Matthew, and the trenchant denunciation of Capernaum in the eleventh chapter, are mutually exclusive; and in Jesus's words about the capricious children of Galilee—the wedge driven so vigorously and so hostilely into my representation—which Hilgenfeld would reckon among the severest utterances of rejection, they have not seen the historical truth where it needs no trouble to bring it to the light. But let the critics, and still more the future, make what objection they will to these expositions, I still contend that the general course of the life of Jesus is faithfully and accurately portrayed, and that the details are drawn with all the correctness at present attainable. And if any one among my contemporaries has a better knowledge, I will gladly thank him from my heart for his solution of the difficulties when he makes himself heard.

Naturally the difficulty of my task was ultimately concentrated in the Synoptical question, now so thoroughly investigated, so thoroughly, namely, that John, for whom Weizsäcker still makes some feeble reservations, is no longer regarded as historical: a result towards which a quantity of definitive evidence is afforded by the history of the Passion—notably in the Roman watch, in the trial by Pilate, in the figure of Nicodemus—and by the recent treatise upon John's residence in Asia Minor by Scholten (1872), who, following in my and Holtzmann's footsteps against Riegenbach, Steitz, and Krenkel, has perhaps gone only too far in making a clear board in Asia Minor. As to the Synoptical question, however, I have made it no secret that in my criticism upon these writings I have not yet said my last word. I would now make an alteration here and there in the questions of date, sources, and composition. I would, for example, date Matthew—as the later volumes show—at the beginning of the atro-

cities of the Zealots, in the spring of A.D. 68; Luke (in view also of the Acts of the Apostles), at the beginning of the reign of Trajan; Mark, according to x. 30 (notwithstanding the Sinaiticus), towards the close of the same reign; John, in the Gnostic epoch under the emperor Hadrian. But these are unimportant alterations that leave the general subject altogether in the same position as before; their value at most lies in the fact that they seriously attack the chronological question which has been so heroically, so unpardonably, evaded by recent and the most recent critics, as, *e.g.*, by Weiss (*Markus*, 1872). In other respects I have found the old conclusions copiously confirmed. That Matthew, notwithstanding his group system, occasionally to the most striking refutation of the hypothesis of a collection of sayings, is in detailed reports the simplest and most faithful source, I have shown to my opponents with "painful" minuteness. That in the great crises also he adheres the most closely to historical truth, is made sufficiently evident to dispassionate observers by the position he gives to the mission address, and by his portrayal of the journeys of retirement, which alone explain the Easter Messiahship. And even as to the position of the Sermon on the Mount, some consideration for the visible presuppositions of Matthew (iv. 23—25), and open eyes for the—even according to Weisse and Scholten—less ancient histories of Jesus's first appearance by Luke and Mark, will still leave room for difference of opinion.

But what are these results to the self-satisfied, clannish, and propagandist devotees of Mark? Although none of the thoughtful representatives of the preference for Mark shut their eyes to the numerous traces of later colouring in this book, how stubbornly they defend the originality of its general arrangement! Weizsäcker, in his friendly and subtle verdict, almost reckons it a sin in me that I will not accept conclusions that, according to his assurance, have long since been arrived at. He avoids admitting that Matthew alone has given the tragical issues of the Galilean ministry with fidelity to nature, by a remarkable appeal

to the fact that the great nature-miracles connected with those issues show a basis of untrustworthy myth,—as if these mythical accessories did not for him, and particularly for him who will not sharply distinguish between nature-miracles and miracles of healing, run through the whole life of Jesus without destroying its historical character. He moreover makes an advocate's use of my placing of the Gadara journey, as if I had not myself brought that journey merely hypothetically into this connection. More consistently he then goes so far as to complain of the detailed criticism against Mark as "painful," although his own standpoint allows even this to him, except that the energy of his criticism—exactly as in the case of the fourth Gospel—is qualified by the strong desire not to do too much harm to the yet again preferred Mark. Though, as the most striking instance against the severity of my detailed criticism, he has adduced the example of Scholten—who shows the opposite—yet he knows that examples prove nothing; that moreover he and Scholten stand partly, and the great earlier critics wholly, on my side; and that no one is apt to believe in the modern myths of the originality of Mark's cock-crow and of the miracle-less primitive Mark (Scholten), or of Matthew's borrowing of the resurrection chronology from Mark (Weiss), and in numberless other opinions of the party. Since, in spite of everything, I have here and there done justice to the later Gospels, I have the happiness of being superior to the charge of a one-sided devotion to Matthew, and of having in the history of Jesus gone somewhat beyond the controversies of to-day. But here I come at once into collision with another antagonist. For here Hilgenfeld is already on the field, and, rashly ignoring all the rest of my achievement, and judging me with his harsh *charisma*, forbids the breaking up of the groups of Matthew which I, contrary to his superstitious regard for the chapters, have upon good grounds carried out! Then again, in the same moment, he meets me with a defence—*against* Matthew—of his primitive Gospel of the Hebrews, the different age-strata of which and its historical worthlessness I,

with others, have long insisted upon. And when at last I have the good fortune to agree with him in preferring extra-canonical productions to Matthew, he once more opens a quarrel with me, after a cursory reading of my construction of the confession of Sonship, by calling himself the predecessor or discoverer. I pass by these attacks, because up to the present I do not find that I am wounded or that the history of Jesus is seriously injured, while the critics themselves are greatly at variance; of which, indeed, in another direction, the pastor of Erlenbach affords a good example by despising proud Ritt's party, which Tholuck reckons among the best. Should it become necessary, I will elsewhere take up my weapons and will give to those who, without one serious argument, oppose or superciliously reject this Gospel criticism, the satisfaction of carrying the war into their own camp.

Yet another prosaically useful word about the technical construction of this book. Several half-promises have not been fulfilled. The history of this history and the Tables of the Gospels have been, for reasons easily understood, omitted; instead of them are two indices, the compilation of which has not been the most agreeable labour. Recent literature, down to Gess and Steinmeyer and Noack, has been fully utilized as it has appeared. Now and then I have been able to pay regard to Weiss and even to Krüger-Velthusen; but I would not alter anything in the earlier portions, partly on their own account, and partly on account of the somewhat obscure language of Weiss concerning my criticism. Here and there a gap may be found in the literature: but the reader can imagine the Sisyphean task of going through the subject again from the beginning with every new individual history, and that after the completion of the book. However, the most important representatives, from Paulus, Schleiermacher, Strauss, Weisse, Neander, downwards, have always been listened to. Down to the beginning of the [fourth English] volume, the earlier editions of Strauss and Neander have been referred to; after that, in the most important

part of the work, the latest editions have been quoted (Strauss, 4th ed., 1840; Neander, 6th ed., 1862). Lightfoot—who, with his successors, has reproduced the Talmud for me—has been quoted throughout from the Rotterdam edition of 1686.

Twelve years ago to-day my inaugural address on the “Human Development of Jesus” opened the series of my inquiries. As the conclusions of that little treatise have become widely known, and their fundamental ideas have been everywhere utilized—at last by Gess in his manner—I can dismiss this work with no better wish than that it may be as favourably received by its readers as its predecessor. May the truth help to silence petty strife!

TH. KEIM.

ZÜRICH, DECEMBER 17, 1871.

Second Part.

THE MESSIANIC DEATH AT JERUSALEM.

DIVISION I.—ARREST AND PSEUDO-TRIAL.

First Hour.—GETHSEMANE.

THE company broke up after the last song of praise, the second part of the "Hallel," which was sung standing.¹ This was before midnight, in obedience to the ordinances.² Jesus then took his

¹ Earlier literature on the history of the Passion, in Hase, p. 213; Wichelh. p. xvi. More recently, J. H. Friedlieb, *Archæol. d. Leidengesch.* 1843; Joh. Wichelhaus, *Versuch eines ausf. Komment. zu d. Gesch. des Leidens J. Chr.* 1855; Jos. Langen, *Die Letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, 1864; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Die Leidengesch. des Herrn in Bezug auf die neueste Kritik*, 1868; Ch. Ed. Caspari, *l.c.* 1869, pp. 159 sqq.; M. Kirchner, *Passahfeier*, 1870; Aberle, *Die Berichte der Evang. über Gefang. und Verurth. Jesu*, in the *Kathol. Quartalschrift*, 1871.—It is not quite certain what were the contents and extent of the second Hallel, as indeed there was a controversy concerning the commencement of the Hallel in the beginning of the meal (the Shamaites, Ps. cxiii.; the Hillelites, Ps. cxiv., also), Lightfoot, p. 459. The second part of the Hallel (Ps. cxv. cxvi.) was usually sung after mixing the fourth cup (before the blessing and the drinking; Lightfoot, p. 381; Schöttgen, p. 230; Friedl. p. 58, against Buxt. pp. 613 sqq., and recent writers); also the so-called birkat hashir (the song of blessing); see passages above. After the drinking of the fourth (fifth) cup, followed the great Hallel, the limits of which have been very differently stated (usually Ps. cx.—cxxxv., comp. Buxt. and Schöttg.). Since Jesus' rite closed with the third cup, it is not possible to determine the extent of what was sung at the close. The most plausible conjecture is Ps. cxv.—cxviii. The birkat hashir, praise of the King of Israel, fully given in Friedl. p. 58. Those Psalms would be specially stimulating in the present situation.

² Pascha post mediam (noctem) polluit manus (Ex. xi. 4, xii. 29), *Pesach.* c. 10, and Maim. Paulus, p. 512; Friedl. p. 59; Jesus would scarcely concern himself with the burning of the remains of the lamb (Ex. xii. 10), but would leave this to the master of the house. Comp. Friedl. p. 59.

way as usual: from the city he went over the Kidron brook to the Mount of Olives, this being a short road to Bethany. No difficulty arose as to satisfying the legal requirement to spend the night in the festival city, for that custom had declined, and moreover Jesus might have eaten the lamb at Bethany.¹ It was doubtless at this point that the unfaithful Judas left him. The earlier Gospels contain not a word of the statement of John, that Judas went away, or indeed was sent away by Jesus, during the meal.² But this Johannine report, notwithstanding its high colouring—on which we have sufficiently dwelt—is instructive in one direction: the earlier departure of Judas can be said to be the ending of a condition of things as intolerable for himself as for Jesus, whose farewell rite, whose last supper, suffered the most painful disturbance, nay desecration, from the presence of the betrayer. Yet the situation becomes a very different one if it is the fact that Jesus did not point out who was the betrayer. In that case the toleration of the latter to the end, and the last sunbeam of softening though certainly futile love, are undoubtedly acts of a higher character than the harsh dismissal; they

¹ Ex. xii. 22; Dent. xvi. 7. Also *Pesach*. f. 95, 2: tenetur quisque ad pernoctationem. Lightfoot, p. 460 (two days). This difficulty was brought forward by Calmet and Theile. It might be simply said that Jesus had not bound himself (thus Ebr.). But comp. *Tosaph. in Pesach*. 8: posterioribus tempor. comedebatur in uno loco et pernoctabant in alio. Wetst. p. 628; comp. also Wies. *Syn*. p. 365; Langen, p. 129. Add the fact that Bethany, as well as Jerusalem, was a festival locality; see above, V. p. 277. Distance of Mount of Olives from Jerusalem, according to Josephus, 5—6 stadia, scarcely one-third of a league, *Ant.* 20, 8, 6; *B. J.* 5, 2, 3. The Synoptics mention only the Mount of Olives; but the Kidron, mentioned in John xviii. 1, must unavoidably be crossed on the way thither (*Jos. B. J.* 5, 2, 3; 5, 12, 2); perhaps (Luther, Volkmar) mentioned by John because David fled over Kidron and the Mount of Olives from Absalom (and the traitor Ahitophel), 2 Sam. xv. 23. The nachal Kidron (= impure water), by the LXX. and Josephus called χειμαρρὸς = winter-brook, torrent (comp. Wetst. p. 946), by Josephus also often φάραγξ (*βαθεῖα*) = ravine; in Josephus written Κεδρὼν; in the LXX. erroneously χειμ. τῶν κέδρων; in John most probably τοῦ Κέδρων [*Griesb., Lachm., not with Tisch. τῶν (or now τοῦ) κέδρων (ου)*]. It flowed at the east end of the city towards the Dead Sea, and is now completely dried up, although high bridges lead across the valley. Comp. Robinson; Ritter, XV. i. p. 598. Arnold, article *K*. Mentioned in *Jos. Ant.* 8, 1, 5, as the boundary of Jerusalem, over which Shimei was not to pass.

² John xiii. 30; comp. above, V. p. 314. Weizs. (p. 562) wavers between John and the Gospels.

are thoroughly characteristic of Jesus, gems of this evening, of this history. It is also not to be overlooked that the deed of Judas would derive a palliation from the dismissal which, as a fresh and most severe disgrace after the unkind presentation of the bread to him, would excite the strongest feeling of revenge; and if some might prefer to see the guilt of the inhuman deed mitigated in such a manner, others would not fail to discover that what was given to Judas was taken from Jesus. But not a single source tells us when Judas actually left Jesus; it is generally only assumed that he did not accompany Jesus to the Mount of Olives, and the commencement of the walk to that Mount was the most fitting occasion for the separation. In the darkness Judas soon escaped from among the companions of Jesus, but not until he had obtained, from the direction in which Jesus went, the means of tracking him; whilst had he left sooner, he would have been obliged to spy out secretly the time and direction of Jesus' departure. Further, at the hour of midnight the temple watch would be completely and at once at his service for the apprehension of Jesus, since in this night there was a general vigil, and at that hour the temple doors would be opened again for the beginning of the great day of the festival.¹ An express evidence of the late separation of Judas from Jesus might, finally, be detected in the subsequent salutation to Jesus: "Hail, Rabbi!" For this utterance sounded like the scoffing allusion of a Pharisaic partizan who had heard Jesus enjoin upon his disciples, at the close of his farewell rite, "The Pharisees are called Rabbi, but be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your teacher!"²

If Judas thus disappeared and his absence was soon ascertained, it may be assumed that Jesus was now perfectly certain

¹ Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2 (at the Passover), ἐκ μίσεως νυκτὸς ἐν ἔθῳ τοῖς ἱερῶσιν ἦν ἀνοιγνύναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοὺς πυλῶνας. At midnight the people, in their festival garments, began to slaughter the *Chagigah*, Kirchner, p. 25. The temple watchmen were, however, always available, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 4, 6; 6, 5, 3, and through them the captain of the temple, who made his rounds by torchlight (in *B. J.* 4, 4, 6, every hour). Lightfoot, p. 559.

² Above, V. p. 337.

that the storm was close at hand, the storm which none other than the unfaithful disciple was to bring upon him in the next hour.¹ That which was to him now of the greatest importance was neither to lead the betrayer astray by altering his course with human cunning and—as Schleiermacher held—without dignity, nor to give a fresh proof of his superhuman heroism by a calm continuation of Johannine farewell addresses about the vine and the grapes, which, even against the evidence of the Gospels, many place upon the way to the Mount of Olives. But the most important thing to him was speedily to prepare his disciples.² He said to them: “When I sent you without purse and wallet and sandals, lacked ye anything? They answered, Nothing. But now”—continued he—“he that has a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that has no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For my affairs have an end!”³ Jesus had here referred to the speedily coming distress and persecution, to the flights of the disciples, to the menace of the sword, which would almost compel even the messengers of peace to have recourse to the sword. The disciples, however, understood his words literally; nay, the most energetic and the most attached among them had already been prompted, by the visible signs of a storm, secretly to arm themselves for the hazardous nocturnal journey to and from Jerusalem, though no one was allowed to carry arms at the feast.⁴ “See,” answered Simon and

¹ Weizs. p. 562: as Judas took his departure secretly, Jesus was thrown into great agitation.

² Schleier. p. 415. Whilst Beng., Wich., Röpe (this writer after Bynäus), assume, with John xiii. 31, that Jesus had set out from Bethany and the Mount of Olives for the Passover meal at Jerusalem, Langen (p. 199) and others a little better connect the sayings about the vine with the journey to the Mount of Olives (according to John xiv. 31), since the road (at midnight!) perhaps led him past a vineyard. Similar in Noack, p. 242.

³ Luke xxii. 35, comp. ix. 3; Matt. x. 9; Deut. xxix. 5; Joel iii. 10. According to Luke, these words were said before the departure; but they are much more appropriate to the journey outward, after Judas had gone away, as Matthew and Mark also place after the departure the prediction of Peter's denial, which in Luke precedes what was said about swords.

⁴ Weapons forbidden at the feast, see below on the arrest. Renan (15th ed. p. 403) and Volkmar (p. 570), following Reimarus (p. 153: he permitted the providing of

others eagerly, "here are two swords;" whilst Jesus, misunderstood but himself understanding the angry zeal of the word-brave disciples, sorrowfully cut them short with, "It is enough!"¹ Troubled and saddened, he began afresh: "Simon, Simon, Satan has earnestly desired to have you that he might sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. For all ye will be offended in me this night. And thou, when thou hast turned back again, confirm thy brethren."² "Though all shall be offended in thee, *I* will never be offended," answered Peter with twice his usual rashness; for he, his sword in his passionately clenched hand, felt himself wounded in his sentiments, in his purposes, and in his strength, and yet also encouraged by the words of Jesus. "Verily I say unto thee," answered Jesus, "that in this night, ere the cock crow, thou wilt thrice

several swords, in case of a surprise), understand it literally that Jesus thought of repelling force by the force of his tolerably large and partially-armed body of adherents, on which account he could not anticipate a definitive downfall on this night. According to Renan, he renounced this purpose because of the visible fear of the disciples; according to Weizs. (p. 563), at the sight of a sword. Schleier. (pp. 417 sq., 422), Krabbe (p. 440), Hausrath (p. 446), think of defence against assassination; he wished for legal arrest, indeed the cross (Krabbe). Yet this is better than, with Schöttgen, p. 313, Paulus, *Komm.* p. 499, *L. J.* I. ii. p. 193, to bring into view future dangers of the Apostles through robbers in the wilderness and unfriendly men in general, which even Neander (p. 535) and Bleek (p. 420) persist in doing; or with Olsh. to talk of the sword of the Spirit (comp. Matt. x.), or with Weisse (II. p. 178) of the necessary personal equipment of doctrine. Schleier. (*Luk.* p. 275) at one time assumed that the passage had got into this connection only because the attack made by the disciples afterwards reminded the Evangelist of it. Weisse (II. p. 177) surmised the invention of the passage by Luke on this ground.

¹ Simon not named, but probably present, Neander, p. 536. This *ἰκανόν*, as well as the following prohibition by Jesus, shows that he did not seriously contemplate resistance, of which he never could have thought, least of all at this time. For the word *ἰκανόν* does not mean that there was provision enough (two swords would be ridiculous), but it is to be explained (comp. also Neander, p. 536; Langen, p. 198) from the very common form of speech: *rab lecha, lachem* (LXX. has six times *ἰκανόσθω ὑμῖν*), by which a sufficiency of things and of men, also of the sayings of men, was often expressed, comp. Deut. iii. 26. See Gesenius and Grimm. Among the Rabbis often *dai, dajeka*=desine, tace! Buxt. p. 527; Schöttgen, p. 314.

² Luke xxii. 31; comp. Matt. xxvi. 31 sqq.; Mark xiv. 27; John xiii. 36 sqq. It must be admitted that just this connection is quite psychological, whilst Luke unskillfully makes the words about swords follow the disheartening utterances. Weisse (II. p. 177) thinks the word had been spoken on another occasion, perhaps at the changing of Simon's name. On *σπρίζον*, Rev. iii. 2.

(that is, successively) deny me.”¹ But the self-confidence of the disciple was not to be broken: “Though I should die with thee, I will on no account deny thee!” So spoke also the others; and Jesus let them have the last word and was silent.²

These announcements by Jesus, obtained in their most probable form from a juxtaposition of Luke and Matthew, cannot be quite certainly verified as to their every word. The sources are somewhat divergent; and we have been compelled to pass over several instances of Old Testament fulfilment in Matthew-Mark, as also in Luke. We have also passed over Mark’s construction of the saying about the cock-crowing, “Ere the cock crow twice, thou wilt deny me thrice,” a construction which is tangibly unhistorical, and which is merely a play upon numbers, an arithmetical hair-splitting. Lastly, we have left out Jesus’ prediction of his victorious resurrection and of his journey to Galilee to meet them again.³ But the whole is not therefore to be rejected. Thus Jesus could and must have spoken, and Peter have answered. Jesus’ accurate prediction, however, is sufficiently explained, without miraculous knowledge, by his insight into the characters of Peter and the other disciples, who though weak were nevertheless strongly attached and were finally faithful to their Lord; by his presentiment of the paralyzing influence of nocturnal violence on the one hand, and of clearly exposed helplessness on the other; and by his easy prescience of the other circumstances which must necessarily happen. As Jesus was expecting a blow to be struck in the next hour, it was easy to calculate that in the

¹ Volkmar (p. 572) speaks of Peter’s “treason.”

² Comp. the asseveration of Elisha, 2 Kings ii. 2. Origen on John, t. 32, 5: *θερμότερος εἰς τ. ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι*.

³ Old Testament, Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27, free quotation from Zech. xiii. 7, where the interpolation of the biblical passage—as well as Matt. xxvi. 32—is very plainly to be seen (Hilg. 1868, p. 64; on the other hand, Volkmar, p. 572); Luke xxii. 37, Isaiah liii. 12.—In Mark xiv. 30 (notwithstanding Thol. p. 268) the cock-crowing is generally, even by Ewald (p. 553), recognized as having been tampered with (Volkmar: the original poesy!). Already Origen on Matthew, 81, 88, abides by Matt.; Renan (15th ed. p. 403) holds the cock-crowing to be altogether a late myth. The re-union, Matt. xxvi. 32 and Mark xiv. 28, not represented in Luke xxii. 32 sq. Admitted by Weisse, I. p. 610.

course of the next three hours, before three in the morning, in the midst of the execution of what was most to be feared, the disciple's denial must occur.¹ Jesus did not foretell—which he was unable to do—whether the denial would be made at the time of his apprehension, or—as actually happened—not until afterwards. As little did he foretell that it would not be merely a repetition, but literally a triple denial, and that it should occur the moment before the crowing of the cock, a punctual fulfilment which the Gospels, not without a noticeable artificiality, subsequently described.² But the genuineness of the account as a whole is supported not only by the uncommon probability and animation of the speech, but also by the fact that Jesus ascribed to Peter alone, and not to the rest, denial as well as taking offence, in him alone recognizing that blending of courage and fear which could end with a denial. It is further supported by the fact that he gave neither Peter nor any other one credit for the resistance which, contrary to his experience and belief, they afterwards exhibited; and finally by the fact that he held both Peter and the others capable not only of flight, but also of temporary apostacy, the termination of which he rather hoped from

¹ The Jews distinguished three cock-growings (*Keriat hagepher*, Buxt. p. 384),—midnight, three in the morning, and 5—6. The third night-watch, that between the first and second cock-crowings, was called ἀλεκτοροφωνία (Mark xiii. 35). But we must not be too readily led by Mark to think of the first cock-crowing at midnight (Meyer), since this hour was probably already past, and the second crowing, about 3 a.m., would be the one that would come into notice; comp. Lightfoot, p. 382; Wetst. pp. 519 sq.; Paulus, III. ii. p. 537. Ridiculous controversy whether there were cocks in Jerusalem. The Jewish tradition says they were forbidden, quia vertunt stercoraria, Lightfoot, p. 186. Yet there is once, in *Hier. Erub.* f. 26, a mention of the stoning of a cock because of its killing a boy. Reland delivered a lecture upon this subject, and defended in particular the cocks of the Romans and of the Mount of Olives. Schöttgen, pp. 231 sq. Paulus, *l.c.*, rightly remarked that the reference was not at all to the literal crowing of the cock, but the meaning was, before daybreak. Already R. Abia said concerning the cock-crowing: clamavit vir. R. Silas: clamavit gallus. Wetst. p. 528.

² It may be disputed whether Jesus spoke of a three-fold denial, or whether the actual three-fold denial (see below) gave occasion to put the number in his mouth. If, as was quite possible, Jesus used the number, he mentioned as elsewhere (as Paul also) a round number (above, IV. p. 274, n. 2), and the actual three-fold denial is perhaps constructed thereupon. Yet see that itself. Paulus (*L. J. I.* ii. p. 192) only: ere the morning comes, things *may* have happened.

God than expected with certainty,—at least he neither knew nor said anything of the converting influence of a glorious resurrection.¹ These modest and gloomy anticipations could not possibly have been afterwards invented by the Apostles, as has been supposed, though whether to their shame or to their honour the critics cannot say; and they were not strictly fulfilled, for Peter at least was not long absent from dangerous proximity to his captured Master, and his momentary apostacy was at once followed by penitence.² Those who perceive these human limits to the foreknowledge of Jesus will find no stumbling-block in predictions which are confined within the bounds of human possibility, and which derive a guarantee of their truthfulness from their harmony with the previous unadulterated historical facts.³

According to the plain indications of the earlier Gospels, Jesus proceeded to the Mount of Olives by the ordinary footpath to Bethany.⁴ The fourth Gospel is therefore incorrect in saying that he halted in the valley just beyond the Kidron.⁵ This

¹ Comp. Matt. xx. 23. Jesus did not foretell to the other disciples their dispersion (Matt. xxvi. 31; comp. Mark, also John xvi. 32), for this stands too closely bound up with the passage from the prophets. Of the resurrection he speaks only in Matthew and Mark; see, on the other hand, the older passage in Luke xxii. 31 sq. Comp. Weisse, I. p. 610.

² Even Strauss (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 323) finds that these features are guaranteed by the fact that they are opposed to the high veneration for the Prince of the Apostles.

³ In spite of all, Strauss' criticism (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 324, rejecting Paulus' mode of explaining away the prediction, retains a scepticism only somewhat less than that expressed in his earlier *L.J.* II. p. 420, herein differing from Renan (15th ed. p. 403), who admits doubts and warnings of Jesus. Strauss says: "There is every probability that Jesus sometimes met the exaggerated self-confidence of Peter with a caution; but that this happened so immediately before what is said to have followed, and in this particular form, must be doubted." Volkmar (p. 570) adds that Jesus had some prospect of successful resistance by his numerous adherents (with two swords), therefore he could not have said all this. But even without this, the despair of *all* could not have been expected. Both Strauss (*New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 388) and Volkmar (p. 570) have arbitrarily generalized: it is not possible that Jesus could have seen that the catastrophe, therefore his own death also, would happen on the next day. As if Jesus spoke of the next day in what he said of the betrayal and of death and at the Last Supper, just as in what he addressed to Peter where alone there is a time fixed. Thus they establish their "possible" and "perhaps" and "yet not"!

⁴ Luke xxii. 39.

⁵ John xviii. 1.

incorrectness is the more striking since Jesus, though he did not seriously think of even such a short flight as to the two thousand paces distant height of the Mount of Olives, was instinctively impelled not to exhibit himself to the officers in search of him immediately before the city gate; on the other hand, it is true *this* Gospel might attach importance to the removal of even an appearance of a flight which would be distasteful to both Jews and Gentiles, and to the giving, in the self-surrender of Jesus, a new evidence of his voluntary initiative and of his heroism.¹ With this Johannine tradition falls also the ecclesiastical tradition based upon it, a tradition which dates back into the fourth century, into the time of the emperor Constantine and his mother Helena, and shows the Garden of Gethsemane where Jesus is said to have rested, at a little distance to the south-east of the Stephen's Gate, a few steps beyond the brook Kidron, to the right of the road that leads to the height of the Mount of Olives.² But it was upon that Mount, the summit of which could be reached in a quarter of an hour, that Jesus made a halt. We do not know for certain if he ascended the whole height; we do not know if he halted near the footpath or at some distance from it, if at a spot which had already been frequented by him, or at one which he had never yet visited. Certainly the fourth Gospel, following the third, makes the spot a favourite resort of Jesus, one where he had often been with his Twelve, and thus explains the speedy discovery of him by Judas and the officers.³ But, in the first place, according to the other sources, including Luke,

¹ Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 9 (the Jew : κρυπτόμενος μὲν καὶ διαδιδράσκων ἐπονειδιστότατα ἐάλω). Also 2, 66 sq; 1, 55 sq. Comp. above, I. p. 33.

² Eus. *Onom.* 152: κείται πρὸς τ. ὄρει τ. ἐλ., ἐν ᾗ καὶ νῦν τ. εὐχὰς οἱ πιστοὶ ποιεῖσθαι σπουδάζουσι. Jerome, 153: est autem ad radices mont. oliv. nunc ecclesia desuper ædificata. Robinson; Arnold; Furrer, article *Geths.*; Furrer, *Wand.* p. 83. Whilst Arnold has expressed himself quite sceptically as to the locality, remarking that there were other places of the kind in the neighbourhood with similar hedges and trees, Furrer (in *Bib.-Lex.* II. p. 450, where he gives a picture) has fully adopted the unattested tradition.

³ John xviii. 2; comp. Luke xxi. 37, xxii. 39 sq. Friedl. p. 66; Langen, p. 218. Even Meyer: this, like so much in the history of the Passion, is a more exact description and reminiscence of John. Also Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 296.

and according to all probability, Jesus' favourite spot was not at the bottom of the Mount of Olives but at the top. In the next place, it is in the highest degree questionable whether he went to a place where Judas could not help finding him; and it is seen at once that this Johannine representation is again only the outcome of the intention to portray the glory of Jesus' voluntary self-surrender. Taking everything into consideration—that Jesus instinctively went out of the way of violence; that consequently he avoided Bethany, where he could have been discovered and taken without any difficulty; finally, that the older sources, Matthew and Mark, mention the Mount of Olives, but by no means the place of retreat, as the customary way and the favourite spot of Jesus—it seems most probable that Jesus in reality sought a more protected, more remote, less known place near the top of the hill, though perhaps on the western well-wooded slope. The two older sources speak of the place as a piece of ground or a property with the name of Gethsemane; whilst Luke simply mentions a place, and John a garden.¹ Gathshanne in Aramaic, Gethsemane in Greek, the name of the place means nothing else than a press of oils, oil-press. We must therefore think of an

¹ Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32; Luke xxii. 40; John xviii. 1. In Matt. and Mark the reading Γεθσημανει is established, although the codices and versions show considerable variations (in particular, Gethsamanei, Gessamanei, Gethsemane, Gethsemani). The traditional G. is called Dshesmanije. The accepted derivation (already by Origen on Matt. 89) is from gat = wine-press (LXX. geth, 1 Sam. vi. 17, &c.), not (De Dieu) ge (valley), and shemen; or, with Noack (p. 244), gan siman, garden of the standard—cantonment of the cohort of (Cæsarea) Sebaste (!);—more exactly either from the subs. plur. sham(e)nin (st. emph. shamnaja, abbreviated sham(e)ne, comp. Greek long ε), like phagge (Greek φαγε), ahine, Casdaë, Romaë, &c., comp. shamunni = pinguedo, shamninin = pingues; or sing. adj. fem. shemena (shamen), gat shemena (Buxt. p. 2448) = torcular pingue, a fat press. The former is the more probable, because of its greater similarity to the Greek, especially in the ending. See also the great similarity to the form in D., It., Arm.: Γεθσαμ., Γησαμ., Ges(s)am; Æthiopic, Gethaseman. The usual derivation from shemane (plur. subst.), by Paulus, Winer, Meyer, Volkmar, has already been rightly rejected by Arnold and Bleek; as the Aramaic would be formed shamnin, shamne (comp. kalba, lachma, malka, arza; also rigla, shimsha, siphra), a hybrid form between the Hebrew shemanim and the Aramaic shamne would have to be assumed. Bleek thought of shamna (stat. emph. sing.), which however does not at all harmonize with the Greek form ε. Χωριον, in Matt. and Mark, can mean either a property or a fortified place; the latter is not to be thought of.

olive-yard—and not, as is usually said, a farm-yard or the country seat of a friend, perhaps of Lazarus—uninhabited, but, according to custom, fenced around and furnished with a press for the treading of the oblong oil-berries.¹ The people of Jerusalem chose for their gardens and country seats the Mount of Olives. The fertility of these gardens was increased by the water of the Kidron saturated with the refuse of the sacrifices, and their boundary fences were generally substantial enough to render them little strongholds against the entrance of intruders.² This place afforded some little security: the fence kept off passers-by and hid Jesus; and the trees, from twenty to thirty feet in height and with thick foliage to the very bottom, spread over him in the night a sheltering roof.³ The spurious Gethsemane, which is shown lower down on the Kidron, presents to the eye a picture of such a garden, and offers to a mind satisfied with what is material an external framework which it may furnish with thoughts and reflections upon the most oppressed hour of Jesus' life. A rectangular stone wall surrounds the tolerably large piece of land, and within stand, nearly in a circle, eight venerable olive-trees, whose age the believing eye prolongs backwards to the very days of Jesus. Stones lie about under the trees, upon which the disciples are said to have sat, and between which Jesus went to and fro in his prayerful agony. At the south-east corner is shown the stone where the betrayer kissed his Saviour.⁴ Of course the identity of the trees is as little to be thought

¹ Friedl., Lang., Ew., Volkm., speak of a farm-yard; according to many, the young man belonged to the same. Paulus speaks of the estate of a friend, Venturini of the country seat of Lazarus.

² In Jerusalem itself there were not many gardens (comp. Herod's Park), and what there were chiefly rose-gardens; this was partly because of the ceremonial uncleanness involved in manuring. Lightfoot, pp. 186, 382. The manure from the Kidron was sold to the hortulani, particularly to those of the Mount of Olives, *ib.* p. 667. Titus was brought into danger by the natural fortifications of the gardens, *Jos. B. J.* 5, 2, 2. Gardens outside the city with trees, shrubs, vegetables, *ib.* 4, 9, 8; 6, 1, 1.

³ Jesus did not seek merely the open country and a quiet resting-place (Schenkel, p. 281). According to Origen (upon Matt. 26), firstly he was anxious not to be arrested at the place of the Passover meal, and secondly he sought a place for prayer.

⁴ Arnold; Furrer (with picture).

of as the genuineness of the place. Notwithstanding the longevity of the olive-tree, these trees are not two thousand years old; and at the investment of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, the hands of the tenth legion left not a single olive-tree for posterity.¹ A vigorous and half-enlightened piety will, even without any historical traces, still seek the Gethsemane of Jesus where human bungling and art have spoilt nature and reminiscence; and a Protestantism that can grow up here under the influence of relic-worship, has itself passed into Catholicism.

The agitation of soul which Jesus, when surrounded by his disciples and engaged in conversation with them, had mastered and suppressed, overwhelmed him with uncontrollable force in Gethsemane, on the threshold of his anticipated destiny, when he was the victim of the terrible consciousness that only a few hours, perhaps only a few minutes, of freedom separated him from violence, arrest, ill treatment. He longed to be alone; he was constrained to pray. According to Luke, he broke away from the Twelve in haste, and at the distance of a stone's throw, perhaps about fifty steps, threw himself upon his knees.² But Matthew and Mark, with much probability of correctness, represent him as wishing to be not quite alone. According to them, he asked the disciples to sit down while he prayed, and then took Peter and the sons of Zebedee with him as associates in his praying, in order that they with their persons and their love might be his safeguard in his loneliness and in his visible mental anguish.³ "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," said he to his confidants, from whom he now withheld nothing, not even his weakness; "abide here and watch with me."⁴ He then threw himself forward a few steps, and no longer merely kneeling, but with his face to the ground and with the picture of

¹ Comp. Jos. *B. J.* 5, 6, 2.

² Luke xxii. 40 sq.

³ Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32. According to Origen (upon Matt. 91), he chose only the firmiores to collaborare, and that the rather to put to shame their self-reliance.

⁴ Περὶ λ., as Ps. xlii. 6 sqq. (hishtochach, to bow oneself down); Judges xvi. 16; Jonah iv. 9; Eccles. xxxvii. 2. Schenkel (p. 285) is incorrect in saying that Luke took offence at it, and left it out. He rather exaggerates.

the cup of the Last Supper before his soul, he said: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; yet not as I will, but as thou wilt."¹ Thus he continued to pray to and to struggle with his God in the heavens, though not, as Mark represents, with urgent appeals to the Divine omnipotence, nor, as John represents, with an immediate acquiescence in the Divine purpose of this hour, of this passion.² And in reality he nowhere had more help and comfort than there. Even his chosen helpers left him to himself. Not suspecting the nearness of danger, they found neither the strength to pray earnestly with him, nor with Petrine practical energy to counsel a more distant flight. Weary and sad, they gave themselves up to sleep.³ Thus Jesus found them when, at the close of his prayer and with an involuntary and anxious feeling after human protectors, he returned to them.⁴ "Simon," said he reproachfully to the Apostle that had promised most, " sleepest thou? Couldst thou not so much as watch one hour with me? Watch and pray, that ye come not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh weak."⁵ When danger comes, he meant to say, the good intention will end, the anxiety to preserve life will rule, the temptation of the devil will be victorious. Forsaken by his friends, he appealed once more

¹ Abba (comp. Paul, Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 15) Jesus must have said (ab in the stat. emph., or with Aramaic article), but not as Mark gives—translating it like Paul—Abba, O Father! Cup, see above, V. p. 51. On prayer upon the ground as specially pleasing, Justin, *Trypho*, 90.

² The prayer in Mark xiv. 36 (in distinction from the Matthew-like introduction in verse 35) is harsh and wanting in delicate feeling in comparison with Matt. xxvi. 39, and still more with Luke xxii. 42; for the petition is no longer hypothetical, but makes a definite demand based on the divine omnipotence (see thereupon Celsus, 5, 24: God *can* do only what is in harmony with nature). Differently, Schenkel, p. 288; Volkmar, p. 576. In John xii. 27 again (based on the form in Mark) the petition, in the moment of absolute resignation, is accompanied by a recognition of the necessity of this issue. Comp. Gess, p. 176.

³ Heavy eyes, Matt., Mark. Sorrow, Luke xxii. 45. Over-excitement, Lang. p. 215.

⁴ Paulus (*Komm.* p. 549) well explains the unrest and haste of Jesus from psychological grounds.

⁵ Antithesis of flesh and spirit, Gen. vi. 3; Isaiah xxxi. 3; Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. v. 16, &c.

to his God. But as if, besides the first prayer and his mental reaction against the first violence of his emotions, even the sight of the weakness of the disciples afresh aroused his heroism, the second prayer was not a more urgent appeal, it breathed renunciation and resignation, as is better shown by Matthew than by Mark.¹ "My Father," said he, "if this cannot pass away except I drink it, thy will be done!" Thus prayed he again for a time; then he arose, composed and strengthened by this appropriation of the suffering, and went back to his disciples, whom he found afresh sunk into the arms of sleep. "Sleep on and take your rest," he now cried to them with sorrow and bitterness; but his irony passed into seriousness, for he already heard the footsteps of many men, and saw the powerful band of armed officials headed by Judas the disciple. "It is enough," he cried excitedly, in brief, abrupt, thrilling words; "the hour is come. Behold! the Son of Man is delivered up into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us go; behold! my betrayer is at hand!"²

The passion-struggle of Jesus in Gethsemane is not discredited either by the partial contradiction of the accounts in the sources, or still less by the picture it gives us of a human Jesus.³ No-

¹ Mark xiv. 39 (he said the same words), against Matt. xxvi. 42. The hasty Mark overlooked the fine distinction; perhaps Luke did also. Many moderns attach no importance to it (a correct view in Theile, *Krit. Journ.*; Winer, *Eng.* II. p. 353); according to Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 436, the Evangelists were in perplexity how to fill out their scheme of three prayers.

² Matt. xxvi. 45; Mark xiv. 41. Interpolated in John xiv. 31. The concluding formula after Mark, although it is not quite certain whether he does not strengthen the simpler formula of Matthew. The word "Sleep!" is understood imperatively by most (comp. Vulgate), ironically or not ironically, the latter by Origen upon Matt. 96 (comp. Bleek, II. p. 428); according to others, it is interrogative (thus Bleek). Volkmar, p. 574, thinks the first way of reading it insipid (De Wette thinks it inappropriate). Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 452, speaks of a supernatural knowledge of the coming of his foes to the very minute. Paulus, *L. J.* p. 195, says, better still, that he had traced the torches from the temple mount.

³ Schleiermacher's scepticism, pp. 415 sqq., 421 sqq., based upon the three purely typical prayers, the angels, and the swords, proceeds essentially from John, and from the impossibility of a spiritual change in Jesus after the speeches in John xvi. xvii. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 453 sqq., formerly regarded the agony of Jesus as a mythical construction (upon the most meagre Old Testament foundation) with progressive enlargement (from Matt. to Luke and John)—for which view the orthodox ought

thing has to be taken away from the tradition of Matthew and Mark except the third prayer and the third sleep of the disciples. This can be done the more confidently because the number three belongs to the Jewish style of the authors; because the third sleep is self-condemned, for it is left without a word, without a rebuke, from Jesus; and because the third prayer is literally a repetition of the second, and, coming after that and after the voluntary undertaking of the sacrifice, is both aimless and superfluous.¹ But everything else is self-supported. Any one can see, without having verified the details, that we have here a thoroughly genuine passage of human suffering, without adornment, without glorifying exaggeration, without imitation of ancient incidents, and honestly narrated of the Lord who was a man, who, notwithstanding all his greatness and all his resolves, was not without conflict, was not without his hour of sorrow, which is neither to be degraded into physical indisposition nor to be elevated into physical pangs of propitiation, and could as little sink into a daring and reckless leap of heroism into the arms of the death that was awaiting him.² The objection that

really to be thankful—but now (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. p. 390) admits anxiety and alarm on the part of Jesus, which required the summoning of all his moral strength; but Strauss holds that Jesus did not certainly and exactly foreknow what was about to happen, and that the details are largely mythical. Volkmar (p. 575) speaks of the possibility of fearful apprehension, but thinks that the prayer either belongs to another occasion, or was constructed by Mark on the basis of Romans viii. 15; he also thinks there was no disciple present. Weisse, I. p. 611, much nearer to correctness (with rejection of details). Hilgenfeld, *Zeitung*, 1868, p. 65, says the agony is of the highest originality, full of historical truth. Moreover, against the denial of this event, Tholuck's words in his *Glaubw.* p. 306, are of force, "Why this remarkable glorification?" Steinmeyer (p. 43) reproaches Strauss with using empty phrases.

¹ Matthew and Mark have three-fold sleeping and three-fold praying; Luke gives both but once, and then comes the foe. Strauss, however (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 327), rightly says that Luke gives up the triple repetition, only because he intensifies the once. Steinmeyer (p. 43) justifies his refusal to be robbed of the three-fold praying, by a glance at 2 Cor. xii. 8. Is that also a round number? Yes!

² The dependence of the narrative upon the incident of Abraham's offering up of his son, Gen. xxii. 1 sqq.—which had certainly been already made use of in Rom. viii. 32—was thought of by Volkmar, p. 574, as well as by the ancients (Steinum. p. 43). Besides the general idea, Volkmar brings in the hill, and the two servants whom Abraham takes with him and leaves in the background. But here one can at once

he could not so vacillate after his Last Supper thus disappears as an unfounded conception, possible only when the subject is looked at from a giddy height, and not from the standpoint of a thoroughly human life. The opinion that the distant or sleeping disciples heard nothing, is ridiculous in view of the words, which are too great and at the same time too little—that is too humble—to have been invented by glorifying Evangelists.¹ It is easy to be seen that the sleepers were not asleep all the time, particularly not at the beginning, though they slept enough unfortunately to lose many of those words of prayer which to us to-day would have been as gold.² Certainly on the strength of these two Gospels, a speaking Gospel and a silent one are to be rejected. Luke agrees on the whole with the others; but even when he reduces the praying from thrice to once, he is led by his confused Ebionite source to exaggerate. On the one hand, in order to show the terrible intensity of the last temptation-conflict, he speaks, not of an appeasing end of the prayerful agony, but of a continual intensification of it until it issues in a bloody sweat, which is really the harbinger of the cross of blood; on the other hand, in order to the re-establishment of the glory of Jesus,

discover many differences even in what is most nearly analogous; and if emphasis is laid upon the most striking verse, Gen. xxii. 5, καθίστατε αὐτοῦ (thus also Matt.; Mark ὤθετε, as Gen. xxii. 5 fin.), Ex. xxiv. 14 is yet more appropriate, for there the elders (= the eight Apostles) remain behind, while Moses and his servant Joshua go up the mount of God, and it is there similarly said, ἡσυχάζετε αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἀναστρέψωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This kindred passage might not, however, have been present to the minds of the Evangelists, as the contents are very different. Why not rather appeal to the Messiah tears of the Rabbis? Wünsche, p. 81.—Feeble explanation of the conflict by Rationalists: nausea and sickness (Thiess), heated condition (Heum.), chill taken in the Kidron valley and general bodily indisposition (Paulus); comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 431. Atoning efficacy, the Reformers (Calvin, Luther, Olsh., Dettinger, Krabbe, Steinm.). Resistance of human nature, Origen (upon Matt. 90 sqq.), Theod. Mops., and others; more recently, Luther, Paulus, Ullm., Dett., Weizs., Ew., Langen. According to Aberle, p. 7, the human nature of the God-man (!) was altogether left to itself and to the protection of the angels.

¹ On the former, comp. Holsten, pp. 178, 190, and partially Steinm. p. 41 (in order to make John equally probable); on the latter, Volkmar, p. 575. The latter instance, however, Julian the Apostate had already urged, Fritzsche, *Theod. Mops.* 1836, pp. 76 sqq.

² Similarly, Weisse, I. p. 611; Bleek, II. p. 426; Bunsen, p. 409. But already Theod. Mops. *l. c.* p. 78.

he speaks of a descending angel who strengthens Jesus as in the first temptation. This representation is at once obnoxious to the objection that if the angelic strengthening was followed by the bloody sweat, it could not have been of much use.¹ Having seen here the artificial tendency of the later Gospel narration, which, to the perplexity of posterity, did not find the passion-hour of Jesus terrible enough or his passive greatness glorious enough, we might expect that the full development of the holy myth would show us a complete substitution of glory for all suffering whatever. This step was taken by John, when he kept silence apparently about both the distress and the angels, but factually only about the former. John has altogether suppressed, with the name of Gethsemane, the solemn and weighty facts of Gethsemane. He gives us no sorrowing Christ, lying beseeching upon the ground. He gives us in the garden a calm, erect Christ, who is superior to the need of angelic help, and who resolutely and victoriously goes out to the garden to meet those who are to take him. A different representation was not possible to the Evangelist who had to show not a man but a divine person, and who, after the transient sadness in the streets of Jerusalem, and

¹ Luke xxii. 43 sq., Ebionite source. These verses are variously critically questioned (comp. A, B, Sin. corr., hence Lachm. put them in brackets). They are, however, not only supported by Sin. first hand, and by many others, but attacked on dogmatic grounds (Epiph. *Ancor.* 31) as early as by Justin and Irenæus. The intensification of the distress of Jesus, Steinm. p. 75, would reject (without any ground, in view of his blood theory): Jesus prayed not more intensively, but only persistently (!). Interesting parallel to the agony, 2 Macc. iii. 16 sq.; to the bloody sweat, 4 Macc. vii. 8. The historical character of Luke's communication already attacked by Julian, defended by Theod. Mops. on the strength of what he heard from the three disciples, nay, from those that were raised from the dead, *l.c.* 77. The mythical view (comp. the angels of the first temptation, Luke iii.) has numerous defenders, Gabler, Schleier., Hase, Bleek, Theile, Strauss, Meyer, and others. The text defended by Olsh. (internal), Dettinger (external), Ebrard, Lange, Langen, and others. Rationalists: the comforter a man, thus Paulus; and Venturini: the lily hand of Mary! Critics prefer not to understand the bloody sweat (read *καταβαίνοντος*) literally, but to make the comparison lie only in the multitude of drops, not in their colour and quality (Theoph., Grot., Paulus, Kün., Olsh., Dett., Hug, Krabbe, and others). Naturally what characterizes the drops in their nature (Meyer); thus the Fathers, the Reformers, Bengel, Ebr., Langen. Bloody sweat pathologically occurring, and defended by Langen, pp. 210 sqq.; Steinm. p. 75. Comp. Strauss, II. p. 451.

after Jesus's heroic farewell announcement that he had simply to give the world a proof of his love to the Father, and after the closing cry of triumph, "I have overcome the world!" had no room for such a scene of sorrow, the traces of which are here so difficult to be discovered.¹ Fortunately Christendom in all ages, from the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews downwards, has in this matter held more firmly by the early Evangelists than by John.² There has existed the feeling that the man of humanity was the deeply moved and not the unmoved and celestially calm, the suffering and not the exalted, Jesus. When will there dawn in Christian minds generally the conviction that this proud-titled narrator, who has denied and withheld the greatest, the most certain facts, as if they had never happened, is the most incredible of all the witnesses of Jesus?

When we somewhat more closely examine the agony of Jesus, we see that the starting-point of it is as intelligible as its issue;

¹ Comp. John xviii. 4, and xiv. 31, xvi. 33. The ancients, Origen, Julian Apost., Theod. Mops., noticed the silence of the eye-witness John. According to Neander (p. 552), John was not in a state of mind to give the Gethsemane prayer; but according to Theod. Mops., and also Olsh., John found both this incident and the Last Supper sufficiently well narrated by his predecessors; or (Lücke, Thol.) he assumed that his readers knew it from the universal tradition. Meyer, much more correctly, says that it does not harmonize with the farewell addresses, even though the transition from one mood to the other was possible. A far-fetched ground for the omission in Schneek. *Beitr.* p. 65 (against the Ebionite opinion that he needed the help of an angel). The true ground is that John thought this struggle beneath the dignity of Jesus (thus Origen, upon Matt., 92: John describes a divine, the Synoptics a human, nature; comp. recently Strauss and Bauer, and even Aberle). A slight remnant of Gethsemane, John xii. 27 (see above, V. pp. 130 sq.), also in the cup, xviii. 11. Theile speaks of an incorrect placing of the words of sorrow in John xii.; while Lücke, Hase, Bleek, and others, deny the identity (Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 444). Recently, since Bretschn., the Synoptics have been almost universally preferred; though Goldhorn, and particularly Schleier. pp. 428 sqq., with Usteri and others, were for John, but rightly refrained from the absurdity of finding the synoptical Gethsemane possible after the Johannine farewell addresses (Olsh., Lücke, Neander, Thol., Krabbe, Bleek, Weizs., Meyer). The last to be mentioned is Gess, p. 175, who (1) regards John xii. as the weaker precursor of Matt. xxvi., and (2) thinks the fear after the farewell addresses is simply an evidence of profound and tender excitability. Thus apologetics again arrive at the "very good" coherence of Neander (p. 552). Better, Aberle, p. 7.

² Heb. v. 7. Even Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 454) has unhesitatingly made this passage refer to Gethsemane; and Steinmeyer (p. 76) has—with Neander, p. 552; Ewald, p. 555—given special emphasis to this apostolic (!) passage. It evidently refers rather to Matt. xxvii. 46, 50. But the mode of view harmonizes.

the former is affecting, the second elevating; both are edifying and enchaining. The starting-point was really—if we keep close to what is nearest at hand and most probable, and avoid prolix reflections that might have occurred to Jesus under the dominating pressure of that over-heated moment—the human and Messianic clinging to life, the human dread of death which drew him back from his destiny, although that destiny had long stood before his mind's eye, and on this very evening had been the solemn and settled idea which had controlled him.¹ When Jesus began to be dismayed, when he prayed that the cup of suffering might be taken from him, when he spoke to the disciples of a willingness of the spirit and a weakness of the flesh—at one and the same time uttering a warning and making a confession—it was the being delivered into the hands of men, into the power of death, which he mentioned as that against which he struggled; and, even at this crisis making an acute observation, he indicated the shrinking of the physical nature, as the opposition of the spirit which sought to paralyze and to render inoperative the spirit's permanent ineradicable higher resolves and motives.² It is true that against this view of the case there are two doubts, one might say a worldly one and a spiritual one. The worldly doubt, early advanced by Celsus and Julian the

¹ Thus Origen, on Matt., 90, speaking of a seeing assembled the reges terræ adv. Christum, lays (as recently Volkmar has readily done) distinct emphasis upon ἡγοῶτο, the mere principium pavoris, passionis. Then Theod. Mops. p. 76: θανάτου οὐδὲν φοβερώτερον. Wolfenb. Fragm. p. 153 sq., coarsely: he saw himself deceived, he saw that his life was in danger. Recently Neander, Ullm., Schenkel, even Gess. At the same time, many—e.g. Ullm. p. 128; Schenkel, p. 286; Gess, p. 175—have thought that the dread of death was accompanied by sorrow on account of the character of the death, that of a malefactor inflicted by the hands of sinners. Matt. xxvi. 24, 45.

² The Fathers, particularly Theod. Mops. (δειλία σώματος), sanctioned the reference of the words (proverb, Schenkel, p. 289), Matt. xxvi. 41, to Jesus himself. Thus even Bengel, Hofm., Stier. Most critics divert it from him, particularly Bleek, II. p. 426, and Steinm. p. 69.—Further motives have been brought in. Jerome, upon Matt., spoke of grief on account of Judas, the apostles, Jerusalem; moderns have spoken of the pain of separation (Schuster), of half-accomplished work to be carried on by weak disciples (Schleier., Bleek). Goldhorn ludicrously adduces the proposal of the Hellenes! Renan frivolously seeks an explanation in Jesus' recollection of the fountains of Galilee and of the Galilean women! On the whole, in Matt. xxvi. 41, the *psychical* evidently retires behind the *physical*.

Apostate, finds the fears and the bargaining of Jesus with his task unmanly, and contrasts the whining Son of John with the calm human hero of the poison cup, Socrates.¹ That this worldly doubt forced itself even into the church is shown by the considerations which have been resorted to down to the present day in order to remove any ground of offence. It is said that the dread of death is conceivable in the case of one to whom it was not, as to others, natural, but an encroachment upon his deathless nature; and that the bloody sweat is intelligible in the case of one who in truth suffered not for himself but for mankind.² But these expedients carry with them little force; they are both mere hypotheses, the first of which contradicts itself, and the second contradicts the facts of Gethsemane. The whole objection is not really worth so much trouble. Calmness or anxiety in the face of death, cool self-possession or violent excitement, the dread of

¹ Origen, *Con. Cel.* 2, 24: *τί οὖν ποτιᾶται* (cries to heaven) *κ. οδύρεται καὶ τὸν τοῦ ὀλέθρου φόβον εἶχεται παραδραμεῖν, λέγων ὦ πάτερ.* Also Julian, *Fragm. Theod. Mops.* in Münter, *Fragm. Patr. Græc.* I. p. 121; also Fritzsche, *Theod. Mops.* 1836, pp. 75 sqq.: *οἷα ἄθλιος ἄνθρωπος, συμφορὰν φέρειν ἐκκόλως οὐ δυνάμενος, καὶ ἐπ' ἀγγέλου θεοῦ ὡν ἐνισχύεται.* Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 429) quotes the example of one who was executed: Lucil. Vanini, dum in patibulum trahitur, Christo illudit in hæc eadem verba: illi in extremis præ timore imbellis sudor, ego imperterritus morior. Gramond. *Hist. Gall. ab exc. Henr. IV.* III. p. 211. Apart from such conscious rivalry, we may think of the martyrs for Jesus—aged persons, young women, lads, Germanicus and Polycarp in Smyrna, Attalus, Blandina in Lyons, who gladly died, Blandina with the steadfast cry: *χριστιανή εἰμι καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν φαῦλον γίνεται,* Eus. 4, 15; 5, 1. Joy, laughter, singing of psalms, praying, Just. I. 46; Diogn. 5; Minuc. 37; Eus. 8, 9. Also Publ. Gavius, suddenly crucified by Verres, continued to cry only: *Civis Romanus sum!* Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62. The Gospel of Nicodemus rebuts the conclusion which even the devil had drawn from the exclamation in Matt. xxvi. 38, and from this *φόβος θανάτου*, viz. that Jesus was an ordinary man, by the familiar ecclesiastical artifice that Jesus had by this dissimulation (*παίζων κ. γελῶν*) led the devil into a snare. Usteri, *Stud. und Krit.* 1829, pp. 465, was of opinion that if the synoptical tradition was true, Jesus fell below Socrates.

² On the former, Luther, in his sermon on the agony of Christ in the garden, and recently Ullmann, p. 128; Dettinger, *Seelenkampf Jesu*, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, p. 95. On the latter, Calvin, *Comm. in Harm. Ev.* (Matt. xxvi. 37): *non mortem horruit simpliciter, sed quia formidabile Dei tribunal illi erat ante oculos, &c.* But Luther himself, in his first Passion Sermon; comp. above, p. 16, note. Neander (p. 554) is weaker: sympathy with sin. Ullmann (p. 128): struggling with sin. This view is now harshly repeated by Steinm. (pp. 52 sqq.): he has the sin of the world upon his shoulders; no psychological interpretation can be admitted, since such a relapse is inexplicable, pp. 45 sqq.

death or the scorn of it,—all this is dependent upon the physical and psychical constitution, in part upon the national character and in part upon the surroundings of the moment. And even the complete control over nature by the reason and the will, and the pure and mournful passion of martyrdom by the sword and at the stake, are by no means higher than letting the feelings of nature find their own expression. Whether a man approaches death with or without sighing, the chief point is that he dies for the sake of principle. And in this respect there remains no superiority in the Athenian; for whether we consider him in relation to his nation, his natural constitution, his age, his deeds, or the manner and rapidity of his death, he died much more easily than Jesus, who however, as it behoved him, died as calmly as Socrates, and with still more of firm resolve.¹

The theological question appears to be a more serious one. If Jesus faltered, though only for a moment; if he showed himself divided—flesh against spirit; if, contrary to the spirit, he yielded to the flesh so far as to pray to be spared his suffering; if he thus withdrew from all his old and sacred vows; if finally, for his own personal sake, he asked God to interfere with the natural course of things and even with the imperial decree already decided upon, asking therefore for miracle upon miracle, for heavenly legions against those of Rome and the Pharisees; if he did this, was he not then guilty of the sin and the defect of almost carelessly repudiating all his higher knowledge, all the great and strong resolves he had made to obey, with the result of sinking back to the wretched level of the ordinary man, of vulgar Mount-of-Olives Messiahship? But we must be just, before we become indignant. Jesus was on the way towards all this, but at the first step he halted and withdrew his foot. For

¹ Comp. Ambrose upon Luke, 10, 56; Rousseau, in Ullmann, *Sündlos. J.* 7th ed. p. 128: if Socrates suffered and died like a philosopher, Jesus suffered and died like a god; a French *bon mot* of which any rational explanation is lacking. More fully in De Wette, *Wesen d. christl. Glaubens*, p. 270. Paulus good, *L. J.* I. ii. pp. 194 sqq. Also Weisse, I. p. 612: Jesus had an obscure presentiment without clear insight into the course of things, Socrates had a clear knowledge; in Jesus we see nature, in Socrates philosophical abstraction.

a moment in his fear and need, he was the intercessor for his "flesh;" but not for even one moment was he the repudiator of the spirit or of his task. The desire of the flesh was in a certain sense his own personal desire and will, and, with a genuine and full consciousness of his human dignity, greatness and destiny, nay even of the divine love towards himself, he reasoned with God; but there nevertheless stood before his soul the clear consciousness of his spiritual task, of the cup filled by God to the brim; and this consciousness itself again became his will when God persisted, God who could either find or refuse a reconciliation of what was antagonistic, a sparing of the flesh, a bloodless divine kingdom.¹ A drawing back from his task had thus commenced—and that for the second time, if we take account of the violent agitations which he had conquered at Caesarea Philippi—and it even continued so far that Jesus, in his tacit submission to God, reserved the divergence of his human judgment; but it by no means passed into a God-opposing decision of superior knowledge and different action, for the task remained, and God remained, the sovereign will that alone was to decide, and that was to be modified only in case of factual and personal possibility, a possibility which, according to the Hebrew view, either with or without miracle, was never wanting to God. He who thus in the midst of wavering and divergence unwaveringly affirmed the divine ordinance, he who in the midst of giving way clung to that ordinance, he who in praying neither urged claims nor indulged in exaggeration, but humbled himself, did not absolutely place the divine law in question, even though he did so temporarily, because he did not place it in question as to himself, but only as to the heart of God. In one and the same moment unloosing and binding the divine ordinance, he exhibited human weakness and opposing desires, an incipient but not a perfected sin; and in the next moment he victoriously quitted the sinful frontier; for in his second prayer he did not speak at all of the possibility, but at once recognized the impossibility and yielded to it, and

¹ Gen. xxii. 12; Job ii. 6.

instead of praying that the cup might be taken away, he solemnly and resolutely addressed to heaven his human acceptance, at any rate his resignation.¹

Jesus had seen only too correctly when at last he loudly and hurriedly announced to his disciples the arrival of the betrayer. At the head of a large force of officials, whose presence was little in harmony with the regulations of the festival night, Judas approached, having taken nearly two hours to get his men in motion and to discover Jesus—whom he had perhaps gone to Bethany to find—in his asylum on the Mount of Olives.² In Judas' retinue were commanders of the temple guards with their bodies of watchmen, and the number of men would be increased by the servants of the high-priests, since at the chief feast a part of the temple guard would be detained in the city at their posts.³

¹ Comp. Ullmann, *Sündlos*. pp. 129 sq., who here handles his subject in an imperfect manner, and does not treat the agony of Jesus with sufficient seriousness. Thus also Neander, p. 555, and even Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 432. Tholuck finely says (p. 307): even the passions have their crises, as diseases have; when they reach their highest point, they give way, and there is calm. Comp. the Messiah, in Wünsche, p. 82.

² *Mishna*, tr. *Shabb.* c. 6, 4: non exhibit vir cum gladio neque cum arcu neque c. scuto neque c. funda neque c. lancea. Quod si exierit, peccati reus erit. R. Elieser quidem dicit: ornamenta hæc sunt illi. At sapientes dicunt: non hoc est ei nisi turpitude, &c. Friedl. p. 69; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 141. It is to be observed, however, that the question was not merely a controversial one, and that the Jewish troops in foreign service refused only the marching, not the bearing of weapons, on the festival day, *Jos. Ant.* 13, 8, 4; but that fighting was allowed even on the Sabbath in defence of life and of the holy religion. Comp. briefly, 1 Macc. ii. 41; *Jos. Ant.* 12, 6, 2. That there was a tolerably long interval is shown by the prayer of Jesus and the sleep of the disciples. Comp. below.

³ The *στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ* already at the commencement of Judas's treachery, *Luke* xxii. 4; at the arrest, verse 52. Also in *Acts* iv. 1, v. 26. More exactly, there was one *στρατηγός* of the temple (Hebrew, *ish har ha-bait*), *Jos. Ant.* 20, 9, 3; *B. J.* 2, 17, 2; 6, 5, 3 (here *στρατηγός*, elsewhere *στρατηγῶν*). 2 Macc. iii. 4, he is called *προστάτης τοῦ ἱεροῦ καθισταμένος*. 3 *Ezra* i. 8: οἱ ἐπιστάται τοῦ ἱ. (three), by which perhaps another kind of superintendent is meant (comp. the prefecti Shekal., chap. v., Lightfoot, p. 559). The *γαζοφύλαξ*, *Ant.* 20, 8, 11, will scarcely be identical with the *στρατ.* The *στρατ.* belonged to the first, to the high-priestly families (*Jos. B. J.* 2, 17, 2; comp. *Ant.* 20, 8, 11), which gave their bravest youths (*νεανίας θρασύτατος*, *B. J.* 2, 17, 2) to that service. He had under him a chancellor or secretary (*γραμματεὺς*)—who himself stood high in society (*Ant.* 20, 9, 3)—and had police jurisdiction over the whole temple affairs (only not the supreme power of the later Herods, who had control over the temple treasure, the buildings, and called the Sanhedrim together), over the sacrifices and the priests (*B. J.* 2, 17, 2), the security of the temple and its

Hence the somewhat disorderly march and the miscellaneous arms of the numerous force, some bearing swords, others wooden staves. We learn, however, from Josephus that the proper temple guards were to only a small extent equipped for war and armed with regulation weapons.¹ It would thus appear that some resistance was feared, however much Judas, who was acquainted with the circumstances, might have endeavoured to represent the action as altogether without danger; and though the disciples did not make a defence, yet the authorities wished to guard against any scene, any attempt at rescue, when Jesus was brought into the city, the streets of which would not be quite empty notwithstanding the welcome dispersal of the people by the Passover meal.² The third and particularly the fourth Gospels have given yet larger dimensions to the attack. They bring to the spot not only the temple officers and their watch-

courts. They were the inspectors of the temple watch—to which were counted twenty-one Levites and three priests (Talmud, *Middoth*, c. 1); when anything occurred, they were called in the middle of the night by report of the watchmen (φύλακες, comp. ὑπηρεταί, Acts v. 26; Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 3); they also went the rounds with torches, not only every hour, but also at cock-crow, and punished the negligent and slumbering (*Middoth*, l. c.; *B. J.* 4, 4, 6; Lightfoot, p. 559; Schöttgen, p. 232). Hence their position was so important that in many respects they rivalled the high-priest (2 Mace. iii. 4; comp. Jos. *Ant.* 20, 8, 11), and, e.g., at the outbreak of the Roman war, influenced the whole of the priesthood to refuse the emperor's sacrifice (*B. J.* 2, 17, 2). Since the Lives of Jesus and the commentaries do not trouble themselves about this question, it was worth while to investigate it. Matthew and Mark, indeed, do not mention the στρατηγοί, i. e. the στρατηγός and his subordinate overseers (perhaps also γραμματεῖς); but it is clear that Luke has here a good reminiscence, and therefore we cannot—with Volkmar (p. 579)—regard this as an unhistorical exaggeration. Besides the Levitical and priestly φύλακες, there were present servants of the high-priest in the ὄχλος, as the δοῦλος ἀρχ. who was struck. Jos. *Ant.* 20, 8, 8; 20, 9, 2, also speaks of such servants of the high-priests.

¹ ὄχλος, Luke, Mark; ὁ πολὺς and ὄχλοι, Matt. xxvi. 47, 55. The iron and wooden weapons mentioned by all three Gospels. "Burgher watch," Paulus. "Temple soldiers," Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 455. The important passage, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 4, 6, has not previously been quoted: τ. πλείονας αὐτῶν ὄντας ἀνόπλους κ. πολέμων ἀπείρους. Ewald, p. 559, speaks in fact of good equipment.

² Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; comp. above, p. 3, n. 1. We would here refer to Paulus, III. ii. p. 453, where it is held that Judas wished to free Jesus by a rising, but had not thought of the dispersion of the people on this night. More correctly, Weisse, I. p. 446, and Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 296, who hold that Judas or the Sanhedrim speculated upon the stillness of this night.

men, but also high-priests and elders. Judas has brought with him the cohort that garrisons the castle Antonia, about 500 men, under the command of its tribune, besides servants of the Jews, of the high-priest, and of the Pharisees; and the expedition has furnished itself not only with arms, but also with torches and lanterns, in order the more certainly to be able to penetrate into the hiding-place of Jesus.¹

This account is certainly not historical. Some slight objection has long been taken to the marching out of a whole Roman cohort. The employment of half an army against Jesus, the noisy publicity of this tramping of a legion, and the leaving of Jerusalem and the temple without guards at festival time, have been found to be scarcely probable; although with respect to the last one need only recall what was not unusual, viz., a strengthening of the Roman garrison until after the feast by the addition of detachments of troops from Cæsarea and Samaria.² But what is worse is, that this account makes it necessary that Roman troops should have stood ready to be employed in a purely Jewish

¹ Luke xxii. 52 (Mark xiv. 43, comp. Matt. xxvi. 47, represents the troops at least as coming from the high-priests, &c., from the collective Sanhedrim). John xviii. 3. Weisse also, I. p. 448, is against the presence of the high-priests.

² Jos. B. J. 2, 15, 3, &c. Many, with a view to remove difficulties, would understand by *σπεῖρα* Jews, Mich., Paulus, Kuin., Gurlitt, B. Crus., Ebrard, Hase, Bäuml.; therefore also by the *χιλίαρχ.* the *στρατ. ἑποῦ* (Bäuml.), or, if Romans, then it is contended that the *whole* of the cohort was not there (500 men, Lips. *Milit. Rom.* I. p. 4): "naturally" it was only a part, thus Bleek, Meyer, Friedl., Langen; also *σπεῖρα* was now and again (even by Grimm) explained as *manipulus* = $\frac{1}{4}$ cohorts, or a small portion. The silence of the Synoptics concerning the Romans has been explained by the fact that they were writing for Jewish readers (Krabbe, p. 484); or by Matthew's intention to throw the guilt entirely upon the Jews, and the intention of Luke and Mark not to throw it upon the Romans (Aberle, p. 10); or it has even been said that the Romans are included in the *ὄχλος πολὺς* (Maier, Langen). All these shifts are in vain; besides, nothing is more certain than that *σπεῖρα* and *χιλίαρχος* in John simply represent the well-known Roman cohort in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 31; also above, I. p. 267), which was under the command of a tribune (Friedlieb, p. 68: captain!). Strauss is, with most critics, remarkably calm as to this question; in 4th ed. II. p. 455, and in his *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 337, he gives no criticism at all against the Romans of John. Bäuml., in his comment on John xviii. 3, recognizing the impossibility of the presence of the Romans, exhibits much more anxiety, as does also Schleier, pp. 425 sq. John is rejected by Weisse, Scholten, Volkmar, and it seems also by Schenkel, Hausrath, and Pressensé.

matter—a thing which could not happen without the special consent of the procurator present at the feast—and that the arrested Jesus should be led by the Romans instead of by the Jews to the castle Antonia instead of to the palace of the high-priest, and subsequently delivered up by Pilate to the Jewish chief tribunal. This objection is all the stronger because the Roman tribune distinctly appears as the chief in the business, as the deliverer up of Jesus to the high-priests.¹ The evident error of the latest narrator is therefore here shown not only by the earlier sources, but still more by the unanimous accounts of the course of the trial of Jesus, who was taken from before the Jews to the Romans, so that even John makes the Jews, in their jealous defiance of the Romans and of the procurator before whom Jesus was brought, appear to be entirely non-participant, nay, to be in complete ignorance of any previous proceedings.² No help can be afforded to this author by remarking that it was not allowed to the high-priests, without the permission or indeed the co-operation of the Romans, to arrest Jesus, and that Pilate must have regarded and punished the violent act of the Jews as a kind of tumult and breach of the peace; for in truth nothing was formally forbidden to the Jews except the exercise of their legal jurisdiction to the extent of carrying out the penalty of death.³ He is therefore

¹ Whilst Schleier. (pp. 424 sq.) does not object to the presence of the Romans in itself, but finds the juxtaposition of Romans and Jewish temple-guard altogether improbable, most recent critics have quietly accepted the Romans, Neander, Lücke, Theile, Bleek, De Wette, Brückner, Krabbe, Maier, Ewald, Friedlieb, Langen, Meyer, Renan, Weizs., Aberle, Noack.

² De Wette has no ground whatever for his remark on John xviii. 3, that in verse 29 Pilate's conduct suggests that he knew something of the matter before. Schleierm. p. 427, thinks that as he had given soldiers, and as he ascended the tribunal so unusually early, he must have been informed. On the contrary, correctly, Weiss and Baumlein. Defiance, see John xi. 48, xviii. 30.

³ Friedlieb (p. 67) quietly allows the Sanhedrim to have the Roman guard at their disposal at all the festivals. Most critics, however, think of a special requisition, either for the arrest (Aberle, p. 9; on the other hand, Neander, p. 557), or against possible resistance and tumult (Neander, Bleek, Krabbe), or in order to gain the goodwill of Pilate (Schleier.). Langen, p. 217 (against Baumlein), attempts to prove, from Walther's *Juristic-historical Observations on the Sufferings and Death of Jesus Christ*,

rather to be charged with a misuse of the facts that the Jews and Romans, the latter by means of their cohort, subsequently acted together, and that Matthew, in the well-known words of Jesus about the legions of heaven, intimates that from his point of view Jews and Romans, the representatives of the whole world, must exhibit their enmity as well as pay their homage to Jesus. The writer of the fourth Gospel has unhistorically dated back this later co-operation to the beginning, when it did not exist, and when it was rendered impossible by the actual relation to each other of the Jews and Romans, a relation which he, against his own more correct knowledge, misrepresents by making the Romans the police of the Jews.¹ The presence of the torches and lanterns would in itself be a very subordinate and harmless question, especially as the temple captain was in the habit of going his rounds in the temple by torchlight; nevertheless this highly-coloured delineation of the nocturnal scene, a satire upon the men of darkness who sought the light of the world with lanterns, is discredited by the silence of the earlier authorities, and still more by the fact that at the time of the full moon this precaution

1738, p. 43, that the provincials could arrest no one without the co-operation of the Roman authorities. It is a pity that the Gospels, and the Acts (passim), and even John xviii. 29—31, have no information at all to give upon this question. And as (Cicero, *Verr.* 5, 62) the Mamertine senate arrested Publius Gavius and then handed him over to Verres, who crucified him, so says Walter, *Gesch. d. röm. Recht*, I. p. 236 (comp. also Geib, *Gesch. des röm. Kriminalprozesses*, pp. 239 sq., 249), quite correctly, that the local magistrates had the right of arrest, preliminary examination, and retention of criminals. Comp. Tholuck, *Glaubw.* p. 361. Only capital punishment was reserved to the procurator, *Jos. B. J.* 2, 8, 1; comp. *Ant.* 20, 9, 1. *Bab. Sanh.* f. 41a: quadrag. annis ante vastatum templum ablata sunt judicia capitalia ab Israël. The Romans permitted essentially (*Jos. Ant.* 14, 10, 2 sqq.; 16, 2, 4 sqq.; 16, 6, 1 sqq.; 19, 5, 2 sq.) the *πάρρησι* ἔθνη; hence, e.g., the scourgings in the synagogues, 2 Cor. xi. 24; hence the flight of transgressors of the law from Judæa to Rome (ἔξου τιμωρίας), *Ant.* 18, 3, 5; hence, finally, the acting independently of the Romans at the executions of Stephen and James. Comp. Lightfoot, p. 370, and above, I. p. 268. Far more plausible, therefore, and yet incorrect Schleierm. pp. 424 sq.: it was sought, by this requisition, to secure in advance the Roman help of Pilate against insurgents. Again, p. 435: even the wife of Pilate points to previous information. I would here add the (misleading) analogies in *Jos. B. J.* 7, 3, 3; *Acts.* xxiii. 15.

¹ The cohort does not appear until Matt. xxvii. 27. Thus also Volkmar, p. 580. Jews and Gentiles against Jesus, Luke xxiii. 12; *Acts* iv. 27; comp. already 1 Cor. ii. 8. Homage, John xviii. 6, comp. x. 16. Better knowledge of John, xi. 48, xviii. 29—31.

was needed only in the case of the sky being clouded and the sojourning place of Jesus unknown.¹ The former contingency is at least not the most probable, and the latter is expressly excluded by John. Under these circumstances we are compelled to believe that the many soldiers, the torches, and the lanterns, are introduced for the sake of effect; but it is an inconvenient fact that, on the contrary, an arrest without any noise or bustle was aimed at.

In this arrest of Jesus, Judas played a very active part, and one which was not merely given to him, but which he had asked for. He had arranged with those who were with him that he would point out the man whom they sought by means of a kiss, which he would impress upon Jesus according to the custom of the disciples. "Whom I shall kiss is he; take him," he is represented by the Evangelists as having said, though they had no direct ear-witnesses to support them, but simply inferred the words from the deed.² Thus Judas approached at the head of the company, went up to Jesus with the bold and perhaps—with a retrospective allusion to the events of the evening—doubly mocking words, "Shalôm alêka Rabbi," "Hail, Rabbi!" or in a tone of assumed ardent affection, "Rabbi! Rabbi!" and kissed his head.³ From the mouth of Jesus came the rebuke, "Friend,

¹ The temple captain, *Middoth*, 1: *facesque ardentis ante eum*. Thus do I myself offer material to the reproach: Hypercriticism! Light and night (in close proximity), John i. 4 sqq., iii. 19, xi. 9, xii. 46, xiii. 30, &c.

² Matt. xxvi. 48; Luke xxii. 47; Mark xiv. 44 (addition: ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς). His leadership also in Acts i. 16. The custom, above, III. p. 348. Volkmar (p. 578) finds the kiss already in the Old Testament, in the traitor's kiss of Joab, 2 Sam. xx. 9. Why is the transaction in other respects not assimilated in words and acts? Foolish explanation of the sign agreed upon, in Kempii *Diss. d. osc. Judæ*, 1670: to prevent a confusion between Jesus and James, who nearly resembled each other. Lichtenst. p. 415: because they thought to surprise Jesus asleep. Langan, p. 218.

³ Shalom (shelam alak), Bux. p. 2424; Lightfoot, p. 357. The repeated Rabbi (diplasiasm), more cordial, more ardent, as Matt. xxiii. 37. *Siph. in Jalk. S.*: hoc indicat amorem et excitationem. Schöttgen, p. 312. Note *κατεφιλ.*, to kiss with tender caresses, again an exhibition of ardent affection (also among the Greeks stronger, Wetst. p. 523), in Matt., Mark. The kiss in the Old Testament usually on the mouth, Gen. xxxiii. 4, comp. Joab, &c., often (Winer, *Kuss*); among the Rabbis the exocularem caput often mentioned as the most respectful, Lightfoot, pp. 449 sq. Among

wherefore art thou here?" or, according to a later narration, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" The officials then laid their hands upon him and secured but did not bind him.¹ But lo! from among the band of disciples there darted a sword of resistance. One of the two disciples that carried swords, but certainly not Peter, whom John, by an ingenious but mistaken supposition, mentions, and whose sword-deed, if it really belonged to him, would have been as little forgotten by the earlier Gospels as his denial, and would also certainly have prevented his subsequent appearance in the court of the high-priest,—one of the disciples drew his weapon, and choosing the object most easily reached struck a subordinate, doubtless a poorly-armed man in the crowd, a servant of the high-priest, and cut off his ear.²

The Gospels here busy themselves with a number of introduced details. John gives to this servant, that made himself conspicuous in opposing the king of Israel, the name of Malchus (king), but does not—with Ewald—make him the leader of the Jewish bailiffs. Luke and John mention the right ear, and Luke represents Jesus as immediately healing the ear. Matthew, Luke, and John make Jesus protest strongly against the disciple's deed of violence and the interference with the fulfilment of Scripture and the will of God.³ Matthew places in Jesus' mouth the most

the Rabbis the teacher kissed the learner, rather than *vice versâ*, *ib.* p. 382. Comp. *Friedl.* p. 67. Volkmar, without any ground, thinks only of kissing the hand or the foot, customs in the East at the present day. It is remarkable that Langen (p. 218) finds no mockery in the conduct of Judas.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 50. Second form, Luke xxii. 48. Mark is silent as to this utterance, xiv. 45. No Evangelist mentions binding (certainly not Matt. and Mark); on the other hand, Jesus is bound when handed over to Pilate, Matt. xxvii. 2. Volkmar (p. 587) explains John's representation as showing Jesus led to the high-priest Caiaphas as a sacrifice! According to Bleek's adjustment of the accounts (p. 447), the bonds were taken from Jesus only during his examination.

² Peter, only John xviii. 10; comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 460. Even Weizs. and Schenkel let it pass. The friends of the fourth Gospel are accustomed to say that the Synoptics, or the earliest tradition, desired to shield the life or the reputation of Peter. Paulus, p. 570: it was wished not to compromise Peter. Similarly Meyer and Aberle: for the sake of Peter's safety. Overcoming the guards, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 4, 6 sqq.

³ Malchus, John xviii. 10. The name, common among the Arabs and Nabatæan kings (Jos. mixes up *Μάλαχος* and *Μάλιχος*), also among the Jews (a Jewish historian,

detailed and significant utterance: "Return thy sword to its place; for all that take the sword shall perish by the sword. Or thinkest thou that I am not able to appeal to my Father, and he will at once place at my disposal—instead of merely twelve individuals—more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled? For so it must happen!"¹ But the objection lies close at hand that Mark knows nothing about all this, and even Luke and John have other formulæ. Moreover, the detailed character of the speech contradicts the dreadful surprise of the moment; and the lively faith in the efficacy of a prayer for a rescue, in the possibility of divine interference, and in the assistance of a celestial army of succour to the number of 60,000 angels, has been already destroyed by the resignation at Gethsemane.² At most Jesus cried as Luke

Jos. *Ant.* 1, 15), is best derived, partly from melech, Aram. malka (king), comp. Hitzig, p. 523, partly from Aram. malek (melik, melika, Buxt. p. 1211), *i. e.* counsel (comp. Dan. iv. 24) or help. If the name is not regarded as accidental, the first name is fitting (foe, and according to Luke, client of the Messiah), or even the second, from which also (against Hitzig) *Μάλιχος* in Josephus is originally derived. Word-play after the pattern of Barabbas. Lightfoot, Wetstein unskilfully, Malluch (LXX. *Μαλοῦχ*), whence rather *Μαλχοῦς* would be formed. Späth, in Hilg.'s *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 339, from malaeh, servant (from which, however, Aram. malaka). Ewald's leader, p. 558. Paulus occupies himself a great deal with the ear: Jesus merely examines and gives a remedy. Olsh.: the healing saves Peter. Doubt against the healing, Weisse, I. p. 449, and even Neander, p. 557. Defence of the account, even to the right ear, Krabbe, p. 485, and others.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 52. Next comes John xviii. 11: "Put up thy sword into the sheath (Jer. xlvii. 6; Ez. xxi. 30; 1 Chron. xxi. 27); the cup which the Father has given me, shall I not drink it?" Luke xxii. 51 has only: *ἐἴτε ἕως τούτου*, so far, that is, to the use of violence. Thus Meyer. Others, from Grotius, Bengel, to Bleek and Ewald, artificially break the sentence into two members: "Desist! so far!" that is, go no further. But according to Paulus, B.-Crus., even De Wette, and now Steinm. (p. 102), Jesus here intimated his wish to go to the wounded man! The 12 legions (comparison with legions, Wetstein, p. 524), *i. e.* about 60,000 men (legio, about 5000), points to the Twelve, not to the 24 Roman legions (Dio C. 55, 23), to which half as many angels were equivalent, and superior to the collective power of the world. Comp. *Muhamad*, in Herzog, XVIII. p. 781.

² Weisse also doubts, I. p. 448. Neander, p. 558, refutes himself by showing the impossibility of the petition. Schenkel, p. 290, is against it—Jesus had no time, and indeed did not see it. Hilg. 1868, p. 65, now especially Volkmar, p. 578, derive Matthew's words of the anxious Rabbi, ever ready to retreat, from Rev. xiii. 10. But the expression is different; and would a passage appropriate to Nero and the heathens against the Christians be applied by the "Jewish-Christian" to Peter?

gives it: "Let it go thus far!"¹ Much better attested than the above probably interpolated words, is the subsequent angry address of Jesus to the band of bailiffs, after they had done their work: "Ye are come out to seize me with swords and staves as against a robber! I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye did not seize me! But it is in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled!"² Whether in the presence of those that arrested him he mentioned the Scriptures or only the will of God, he would be likely to think of Isaiah, the servant of God, who was made a transgressor; at least, according to Luke, Jesus mentioned this passage before he went out to the Mount of Olives.³ The same third Evangelist represents Jesus as reminding the officers of the dark satanic secret which according to his opinion had been perfected by the entry of the devil into Judas: "But this is your hour and the power of darkness."⁴ Meanwhile, in view of the unanticipated but accomplished fact, the disciples without exception hurriedly fled; and we shall find indications that with most of them the flight did not end until they found themselves at home in Galilee.⁵ This flight was scarcely necessary. Judas and the high-priests knew whom they sought, and they wanted no one but Jesus. If the dreaded one were arrested, the movement itself would be arrested; the harmless band of disciples,

¹ See above, p. 30, n. 1.

² Matt. xxvi. 55; Luke xxii. 52; Mark xiv. 48. The conclusion, according to Mark and Matthew. Many, since Erasmus, have regarded the reference to the Scriptures in Matthew as the independent reflection of the author (thus still De Wette, Bleek, Hilg.), Mark then made it the words of Jesus; incorrectly, in spite of the genuine Matthew-formula, comp. only verse 54. Yet it is permitted to doubt whether Jesus, in the presence of the bailiffs, would make a direct appeal to the Scriptures (Weisse, I. p. 613; Volkmar, p. 580). But how often does, e.g., Paul set the Scriptures for God?

³ Luke xxii. 37 (Isaiah liii. 12). Comp. above, IV. p. 276, n. 2.

⁴ Luke xxii. 53. The darkness is not the physical darkness of night (thus Theoph., De Wette, Bleek, and to some extent Meyer), nor is it sin, Matt. vi. 23 (Kuinoel, Olsh.), but (Col. i. 13; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 14; Rom. xiii. 12) Satan (the ancients and B.-Crus.). Still the expression does not refer to the supposition that night is the domain of evil spirits, comp. Lightfoot, p. 526; Schöttgen, p. 316. But from Luke is formed John xiii. 27, 30.

⁵ On the breathless flight, see Jos. *B. J.* 4, 2, 4; 4, 3, 1.

whom it would have been easy to secure, might be contemptuously allowed to escape, though Jesus himself had feared that his disciples would share his fate.¹ Hence subsequently in Jerusalem, notwithstanding the accusations made against Peter by the servants and maids, there is no trace to be found of an attempt to secure Peter or indeed any of the adherents of Jesus. In this case we have to give up the otherwise completely unattested and improbable account by Mark of a young man in a linen shirt, that is in a night-dress, who when seized by the bailiffs threw off his shirt and ran away naked.² Besides, Jesus would be accompanied by none but the Apostles, the few faithful adherents who had partaken of the night meal with him, certainly not in mere linen shirts; but this young man is plainly described as not being an Apostle. On this last account, therefore, those who understand the young Jerusalemite to be intended for Mark are more likely to be correct than those who look for him in John, or even James the elder brother of Jesus, the Apostle or half-apostle, or in Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles.³ The myth of the young man arose in the first instance out of the passage in Amos: "He, among the heroes, who has a brave heart, shall then flee naked;" and the growth of the myth

¹ Matt. xvi. 24, xx. 22, xxvi. 34; Luke xxii. 31, 36, &c. Weizs. (p. 564) incorrectly explains the sword-stroke as the result of an attack upon the disciples.

² Mark xiv. 51. Comp. Winer, *Kleider*. The shirt, *sadon*, was worn next to the bare body; over it the *χιτών*, *ketonet*, under-garment, which was thrown off when at work in the summer, but particularly in the night, without leaving the wearer naked, John xxi. 7; Eus. 6, 40; Lightfoot, p. 461: *sindonem* in *æstate*, *chlamydem* *hieme*. Comp. Friedl. p. 70; Langen, p. 224. Lightfoot, *l. c.*, found here an ascetic indicated! Volkmar (p. 578) seems, like Grot. and Schöttgen (p. 253), to assume two shirts, *γυμνός* to be in nothing but a shirt. This would be more decent, but contrary to the text. He will not relinquish the historical character of the incident.

³ Mark (or one standing near him) was thought of by Paulus, Olsh., Lange, Volkmar, and others. A dweller in the farm-house, or the garden-house, was thought of by Grotius, Paulus, Friedl., Langen, Hausrath; one who belonged to the house where Jesus had eaten the Passover, by Vict. Ant., Theoph.; John by Ambrose, Chrys., Gregory the Great; James by Epiphan.; Paul by Ewald, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 339; comp. Friedl. p. 70; Langen, p. 223; Meyer on Mark. A friend is thought of by Weisse, I. p. 449; an Apostle by Weizs. p. 564. According to Ewald, he wished to spring to help Jesus, to make a noise, p. 561.

may have been assisted by the recollection of the command of Jesus to give to the importunate foe both under-garment and cloak, as well as of the prediction uttered on the Mount of Olives: "Let him that is in the field not return back to fetch his clothing."¹

Thus Jesus, in the hands of his foes, was forsaken by all. A moment, a stroke, the stretching forth of the hands of the miserable temple guard, and the Messiah of God became, as Judas had anticipated, the powerless victim of the triumphant human arm. The faith of later Christians could not remove this weighty objection by a spiritual glance at the Gethsemane renunciation of Jesus, a renunciation in the first place of material self-help, but in the second place also of material help from God. The Church wished to see with the eye, to hear with the ear, to touch with the hand, the possibility that Jesus, even at the last moment, might have saved himself by miraculous means. In this sense, Matthew introduces the saying of Jesus to the man who had a sword, that, if he wished it, legions of angels would be at his service. In this sense, Luke narrates the royal miracle of healing wrought upon the foe. In this sense, finally, John, the champion of the glory of the Son of God, re-models on a grander scale the whole history of the arrest. With him there is no longer a question merely of possibilities; he shows realities by making the miraculous words of Jesus, of the person that even at the point of death retains his most wonderful character, capable of hurling the cohorts to the dust, of extorting homage from them, of saving the disciples, of disarming violence, only that Jesus may finally surrender himself to force, to the otherwise not attested

¹ Amos ii. 16 (also in Volkmar); Matt. v. 40, xxiv. 18. Strauss (formerly 4th ed. II. p. 462; recently, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 341) expresses himself very indefinitely concerning this incident: tradition, imagination, or what not, lies beneath it. On the other hand, Volkmar, p. 578, has this time more confidence in the narrative. Orthodoxy here naturally attaches itself in part to Mark, and in part to the supposition of a greater accompanying band of adherents, which is unhistorical. We recall the fact that the Gospel of the Hebrews drags into the night-meal another who is not an Apostle, James, the brother of Jesus.

bonds, as the free man and the voluntary prisoner, in truth as the voluntary sacrificial lamb for the disciples and the world.¹

Thus here Jesus, going to meet his foes and knowing everything beforehand, went courageously out of the garden: "Whom seek ye?" "Jesus the Nazorean," they said. He said—as he was wont to say only when he spoke of himself to the Jews as the Messiah and the representative of God—"I am he."² Then they went backwards and fell to the ground. They did this without the presence of heavenly legions, and merely under the influence of the Son of heaven. It was therefore necessary for him to impel and stimulate them to their work. He repeated his question; they repeated their answer. He then allowed them to act, but compelled them to refrain from touching his disciples. "I have told you that I am he; if now ye seek me, let these go away." Thus was his own prophetic utterance in his high-priestly prayer to be fulfilled, "Of those whom thou gavest me, I have not lost one;" and in truth at the same time the word of God in Isaiah, "No one shall snatch them out of my hand."³ It belonged to this representation that Judas should pass into the background, that his rôle should diminish. John says simply that Judas "was standing by."⁴ It was quite con-

¹ John xviii. 4. We are reminded of the points of view in John viii. 28, x. 16—18, xii. 24, 28, xiii. 31. Bonds, only in John xviii. 12.

² ἐγώ εἰμι, John xviii. 5, 6, 8, comp. iv. 26, vi. 20, viii. 24, 28, 58, xiii. 19; comp. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 338; without special significance in the case of the man born blind, ix. 9 (in the Synoptics only in Matt. xiv. 27 and parallel passages, Mark xiv. 62). In John xviii. 5 sqq., vi. 20, it simply expresses the identity of the person; but in the other places it is an assertion of Messiahship, the decisive answer to the urgent question as to the Messiah (comp. x. 24, vii. 40 sqq., xiii. 19, xvii. 8). This self-testimony concerning the real Messiahship is, however, at the same time the testimony for the genuine divine Sonship; it is also the watchword of God: ani hu, ἐγώ εἰμι, Is. xliii. 10 (comp. only John viii. 28, and this passage from Isaiah; also John x. 28 sq. and Is. xliii. 13); ani, ani hu, ἐ. ἐ. κ. οὐκ ἔστι Θεός πλὴν ἐμοῦ, Deut. xxxii. 39. In so far there lies in the expression also the sense of the Pauline εἶναι τι, and Acts viii. 9, εἶναι τινα μέγαν.

³ John xviii. 8 sq., comp. x. 28, xvii. 12. Isaiah xliii. 13. Neander, p. 558, and Weizs. p. 564, believe (as Olsh. on the ground of the healing) that Jesus really procured for his followers the opportunity of fleeing.

⁴ John xviii. 5. He was not on that account merely a bystander, verse 3 (Volkmar).

sistent with the standpoint of the higher glorification of this history to break the hateful initiative of the traitorous Apostle, and to eliminate the desecrating play of the kiss which Luke had already artistically suppressed. There were two reasons for this: the initiative must stand on the side of Jesus, he must give himself instead of being given; and his foes, Gentiles and Jews, Judas not excluded, must first fall to the ground before him who was about to die.¹

These incidents, noble as they may appear, and well as they in some respects give expression to our sentiments, to our faith in the greatness and dignity of Jesus, nevertheless themselves compel the historical verdict as soon as they are compared with the sober facts of the early Gospels. It is of no use to attempt to explain them by referring the falling down of the officers, not to a miraculous power in Jesus, or more correctly to the manifestation of God in him, but more modestly to the natural impression produced by his spiritual greatness. Nor is it of any use to attempt to diminish them in any other ways, and in particular by the quite ludicrous assumption that only the Jews, and not the Roman legionaries, were thrown down.² The other

¹ Already Luke (xxii. 47) speaks only of an approach of Judas *in order to* kiss. Jesus rebuked him, but it is by no means said that the kiss was actually given. This delicate point has not been noted. It has been as little seen that Judas did not fall down, although this is the meaning of the remark in John xviii. 5 sq. The initiative according to John x. 18. Justly rejected by Strauss, II. pp. 455 sqq.; Weisse, I. p. 448. On the other hand, Bunsen, p. 409, for John: Jesus would have warded off the kiss.

² Psychological explanation in Lücke, Hase, Thol., Olsh., B.-Crus., De Wette, Lange, Sepp, Friedl., Baüml., Ewald. Paulus makes the disciples fall, Olshausen only some of the officers, Lücke and Thol. only the foremost, Neander, De Wette and Krabbe only the Jews; and Ewald makes those referred to merely sink *as if* to the ground (justly ridiculed by Langen). Miracle, the ancients, Ebr., Luther, Bruckn., Mai, Meyer, Langen, after which everything falls. The psychological explanation could be best based upon John vii. 33, 44, 46, &c. Lange spoke of conscience. The example of Marius and M. Antony has been adduced, before whom the slaves or soldiers appointed to be murdered fled away (Vell. 2, 19; Val. Max. 8, 9, 2); also Teligny, the son-in-law of Coligny (Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 458), and the Polish bishop Stanislaus. Why not also Simeon, Joseph's brother, whom seventy strong Egyptians were to have bound, but *audito ejus clamore in faciem ceciderunt, ita ut dentes ipsis frangerentur?* *Tanch.* f. 16, 1, in Schöttgen, p. 400. The true explanation in the power of God that strikes men to the ground, nay kills them, comp. Ex. xxxiii. 20;

narrators do not exhibit even this natural impression, but rather an audacity on the part of the betrayer, a daring on the part of the officers. Moreover, the conception that a merely spiritual impression forced certain conscientious concessions from the determination of the betrayer and from the brutality of the armed men, finds no support elsewhere. Hence even John allows the fact to appear as an entirely involuntary and purely physical one.

Second Hour.—CAIAPHAS AND THE NOCTURNAL TRIAL.

The prisoner was at once led to the city and into the house of the high-priest who had commanded the arrest. This high-priest was no other than Caiaphas, whom Matthew expressly mentions twice, and whom John repeatedly speaks of as the officiating high-priest of the year.¹ In contradiction to this, however, the latter Evangelist brings forward the alleged father-in-law of Caiaphas, Annas the ancient, as the first judicial examiner of Jesus, but as afterwards—though still in the night—sending Jesus bound to Caiaphas.² This report of John's has been frequently regarded,

Judges vi. 22, xiii. 22; especially Daniel viii. 17; 2 Macc. iii. 27; Acts v. 5 sqq., ix. 4, &c. 2 Thess. ii. 8 is less apposite.—The attempts to harmonize the Synoptics and John, with reference to the coming of Judas and the meeting with Jesus, in Paulus, Lücke, Hase, Tholuck, Olsh., and others, recently Langen (p. 219), need not be here again referred to. Comp. Strauss, 4th. ed. II. pp. 455 sq.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 3, 57: πρὸς Κ. τὸν ἀρχ. John xi. 49, xviii. 13, 24 sqq. Luke xxii. 54 and Mark xiv. 53 give only τὸν ἀρχ., and not the name. The residence, see above, V. p. 283, n. 4; see also below.

² John xviii. 13—24. Annas—(Jos. "Ἀναρὸς; Luke, Acts, John, "Ἀννας); Hebr. chanan, Aram. chan(n)ana (Bux. p. 795), *i.e.* clemens—the son of Seth (*Ant.* 18, 2, 1), was made high-priest by Quirinius in A.D. 7, after the deposition of Joazar (see above, I. p. 262), deposed by Valer. Gratus in the autumn of A.D. 14 (after the assumption of the government by Tiberius), *Ant.* 18, 2, 2, and esteemed happy by the Jews because all his five sons became high-priests, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1 (though not without bribery, Lightfoot, p. 668). In distinction from these ὁ πρεσβύτερος, *ib.* Sepulchral monument, Jos. *B.J.* 5, 12, 2. His sons: Eleazer, about A.D. 16; Jonathan and Theophilus, A.D. 36 and 37; Matthias, A.D. 42, 43; Annas the younger, A.D. 63. Father-in-law (against above, II. p. 383), below, p. 39, n. 1. Compare my article *Annas*, in *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 135.

even by critics—though without any justification—not only as an intentional, but also as a factually true correction of the earlier Gospels.¹ If Caiaphas was the actual, officiating, and ruling high-priest; if he was, on account of a not merely one year's—as it would appear according to John—but of an eighteen years' truly dreaded administration, in the highest degree powerful; if, finally, he was, even according to John, the soul of the attack upon Jesus; then *he*, and not his aged father-in-law who had long since retired from office, had the prerogative of hearing the report of the arrest, and of first examining the prisoner. Yet whilst, contrary to all possibility, in John the first trial by Annas is given in the most emphatic and decisive manner, that by Caiaphas is unpardonably ignored.² Among many other empty suppositions, it has been suggested in a frivolous manner that perhaps Annas was the president of the Sanhedrim, and as such had the first right in the trial: as if John would know any other ground than the—in itself uncertain—relation of father-in-law, and as if the earliest sources, from Josephus to the Acts of the Apostles, left any doubt whatever that the actual high-priest, and not another, was the president of the judicial tribunal.³ But

¹ Even Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 462, is inclined to find the examination before Annas possible; the Synoptics have passed him over because he could not decide. In his *New Life of Jesus* (Eng. trans. II. p. 346) he is (like Weisse, p. 452) more critical. On the other hand, not only does Hausrath (pp. 441 sqq.) declare himself for Annas and assert the nullity of the lay-figure Caiaphas, but even the criticism of Volkmar (p. 583) discovers that Mark indeed meant Annas, the *Nasi*, while Matthew did not know the particulars and introduced Caiaphas! Thus had the Johannine critics already spoken, one after another, and particularly Bleek, II. p. 438 (the original account had only ἀρχ., by which Luke understood Annas). Then De Wette saw more correctly that by ἀρχ. was to be rationally understood only Caiaphas. Just so Burger, *Ev. nach Joh.* 1868; comp. Steinmeyer, p. 116. Differently Brückner.

² Caiaphas, above, V. pp. 282 sqq. Ewald (pp. 562 sq.) thinks it improbable that Jesus was taken directly to the chief high-priest. And yet, with all the others, he thinks that Annas was really the highest of all. In the Talmud mention is made of a temporary retirement of a defiled high-priest from his office (Friedl. p. 74; but see already, *Jos. Ant.* 17, 6, 4; above, I. p. 302), or of one less experienced from the presidency, *Light.* p. 668. But who can regard Caiaphas as such? Comp. *Maim. Sank.* 2, 4: adseiscunt pontificem max., si modo sapientia ejus dignitati respondeat.

³ *Jos. Ap.* 2, 22. *Matt.* xxvi. 3, 57 sqq., and parallel passages; *Acts* iv. 6, v. 17, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1. Explanations: Annas dwelt close to the city gate (*Aug., Grotius*),

who is so blind as to seek for the truth in an account which—to refer only to what is close at hand—while it knows something of an arraignment of Jesus before Annas and Caiaphas, knows nothing whatever of an assembling of a judicial tribunal, of a Sanhedrim, nay, which knows only a syllable even of Caiaphas the high-priest, turn the text which way we will?¹ At the same time, John's error is easily explicable out of the previous writers. Matthew and Mark had a nocturnal examination of Jesus before the high-priests and the Sanhedrists, Luke on the other hand a

or in the same house (Euth. and many moderns, see below); he had wished it (Neander); he still possessed, as a "crafty old man" (Paulus), the greatest influence, "was the soul of the administration," particularly "zealous" (thus not only Bl., Brückn., Lange, Langen, Steinm., but also Hausr., Weizs.); he was (since there were several high-priests) co-high-priest (Beza, Scal., Casaub.), perhaps the secular (inferred by Aberle, pp. 14 sq., from *Jos. Ant.* 18, 2, 2); he alternated, in discharging the functions of the office, with Caiaphas yearly (Aug., Petav., Hug, Friedlieb, Oosterzee); he was the Sagan (vicarius) of the high-priest (Scal., Rel., Lightfoot, Brückn.), or the Ab Bet Din = *judicii rector*, the second in the Sanhedrim (Ewald), or even the first, the Sanhedrim president, the Nasi (Selden, Wies., Lightfoot, Bleek, Volkmar).

¹ The silence of the Synoptics about Annas would at any rate be more easy to explain than that of John about the high-priest Caiaphas or the Sanhedrim. It is said, in explanation of the former, simply that the transaction before Annas was a brief (De Wette), an unimportant (Neander, Hase), private (Langen) colloquy; though Schleiermacher thought the Synoptics had confused and identified the two high-priests. In explanation of the latter, however, there is the usual expedient,—John had found the rest well narrated by the Synoptics, and was therefore silent upon it (Euth., Grotius, Paulus, Olsh., Ebr., Bleek, Meyer); or everything else was only the execution of what had already been decided upon by the high-priests (Caspari, p. 155). No better than this is Brückner's opinion that to John the examination was of secondary importance, the principal thing to him being the denial. Hase and Schweizer believed that John passed over Caiaphas because after John xviii. 14, xi. 49, his vote was a mere formality. Many have noted that the omission of Caiaphas is a greater objection to John than that of Annas to the Synoptics. No one can join Schleiermacher in the naïve belief that at the examination before Caiaphas (opp. Annas) John was not present (present all through, Steinm. p. 143). Then it has been found that from John xviii. 15, or at least 19, the reference is to the high-priest Caiaphas, and not to Annas, the evidence to the contrary—namely, verse 24—being deprived of its force by taking the aorist as the pluperfect, and regarding the whole sentence as a parenthetical remark; even Winer, Thol., De Wette, Lücke, Friedlieb, Langen. Justly rejected by Meyer, Scholt. (p. 301) and Bleek (II. p. 437), who (like Wies.) prefers to accuse Matthew of error. That John, when he called Annas the father-in-law of Caiaphas, was thinking only of introducing this relationship as a means of explanation, is maintained by Langen and Meyer, although the former—like Grätz, III. p. 243—believed in the ancient division of the office of high-priest and that of president of the Sanhedrim (p. 232).

morning examination. Then Luke, in the beginning of his Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles, mentions Annas together with and before Caiaphas, and indeed honours him exclusively with the name of high-priest, and presents him as the spiritual head of Israel and as president of the tribunal before which the Apostles were arraigned. This is a misapprehension which could have arisen only from the author's imperfect knowledge of the order in which one high-priest succeeded another, and from his having been led, by the traditional renown of Annas, the seven years' high-priest of the happy Augustan age and the father of five high-priests, to allow even Caiaphas to vanish behind the more celebrated man.¹ How easy it would be for John to infer from his predecessors that there were two examinations, and, as one of the authorities mentioned Annas "the gracious," the other Caiaphas "the oppressor," or both, to place the first examination in the hands of Annas, the alleged high-priest of the first year of Jesus, and the second in the hands of Caiaphas, the high-priest of the second year.² If a special purpose in this representation be sought for, it will be found, since the figure of Caiaphas was already used up by John, in the striving after piquant novelty and an interesting juxtaposition of Jesus with the most renowned of the Sadducees.³

¹ Luke iii. 2; Acts iv. 6, v. 17. Then also the fables in Eus. 1, 10. The five sons, *Ant.* 20, 9, 1; see above, p. 36, n. 2. If it be urged that this heredity of the dignity in the family necessarily prolonged his personal influence, that Luke in particular is to be regarded as a witness for Annas equal in authority to Matt., and that the mention of ἀρχιερεῖς in the plural in all the Gospels makes his co-operation possible, yet all this gives no probability. Josephus makes his high-priestly influence end with his deposition (*Ant.* 20, 9, 1, αὐτὸς κ. πρότερον τῆς τιμῆς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀπολαύσας), and he does not mention that Annas lived to witness the honours of his sons. And if according to the testimony of Luke Jesus was led to the high-priest, and the latter was Caiaphas and not Annas, what can be proved for Annas from the unreliable fourth Gospel? And does there remain, from such a source (xviii. 16, 26!), a support for the otherwise not attested relationship of Annas and Caiaphas? How apposite would be the mention, *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 18, 4, 3; 20, 9, 1! Why are always only sons of Annas, 18, 2, 2 sqq., and other relationships given, 15, 9, 3; 17, 4, 2; 17, 6, 4?

² Comp. thereupon above, II. p. 382, VI. p. 37, n. 3. Also the somewhat different fable of Eus. 1, 10.

³ Strauss and Baur thought two high-priests were named in order to make the condemnation of Jesus more conspicuous; on the other hand, Brückner has already said

In the palace of Caiaphas, Jesus was evidently led into the inner chambers of the house.¹ The house was approached through an outer court; within there was a quadrangle enclosed by the wings of the house.² In this inner court the guards were lying, warming themselves by fires in the cool of the spring night.³ One report—which for other reasons also is to be held unhistorical—repeatedly says that Jesus himself was in this court through the night, and modern critics have deduced from this that the examination took place in that court.⁴ But according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus was not among the guards at all; it is indeed expressly said that he was within and that he was above. Moreover, it is easy to see that the secure keeping of Jesus, his reception by the high-priests, the dignity and secrecy of the trial, all required that the prisoner should be taken inside the house.⁵

According to the oldest sources, not a moment was lost in preparing for the trial; and John agrees with those sources so far as to place the examination of Jesus by the high-priests in

that Annas did not pass sentence (nor did Caiaphas, in reality). Weisse, p. 453: Annas was introduced perhaps because in John xviii. 15 an acquaintanceship between a disciple and this high-priest is assumed, and is now made use of as a source of the account. Schenkel, p. 297: Annas is introduced mainly to show the powerlessness of the Sanhedrim (but xi. 47?). Caiaphas already exhausted, John xi. 49, and Schweizer, see above, p. 38, n. 1. Against the Johannine report, Bretschn., Strauss, Weisse, Baur and his school, Schenkel, Scholten. De Wette is sceptical towards John and the Synoptics.

¹ Comp. only Matt. xxvi. 69; Luke xxii. 54; Mark xiv. 66.

² Προαύλιον, Mark xiv. 68. Πυλῶν, Matt. xxvi. 71. The court, ἔσω, Matt. xxvi. 58; Mark xiv. 54. On the double meaning of αὐλή, above, V. p. 282, note 3. Bleek, II. p. 439; Wich. p. 48. Comp. Winer, *Häuser*, and Friedl. p. 7.

³ Matt. xxvi. 58; Luke xxii. 55; Mark xiv. 54; John xviii. 18. Only John represents the guards and Peter as standing at the fire. Warm weather not until the end of April. Rabb.: finis hiemis gravior ipsa hieme, Bux. p. 1558. Comp. Winer, *Witterung*.

⁴ Luke xxii. 61, 63, 66. Thus Friedl. p. 7, Meyer, Volkmar, who thinks that this accords best with the *Chanujot* of the sons of Annas (p. 583)!

⁵ Peter is ἔσω ἐν αὐλῇ, but also ἔξω in relation to Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 69; and according to Mark xiv. 66 he is at the same time κάρω. How can critics so superficially pass over all this? According to Volkmar (p. 589), κάρω is poetical=under the high tribunal!

the night. Luke, on the contrary, has simply the guarding of Jesus in the night, and places the trial at the break of day.¹ One may here be in doubt a moment. A morning trial would have many things in its favour,—the legal practice, as well as the impossibility of opening a judicial inquiry immediately after an unexpectedly speedy arrest, and of calling together judges and witnesses who were not continually in waiting. And another argument must be considered, namely, that Matthew and Mark themselves also give room for a second assembly, a morning Sanhedrim, the transactions at which it is true they condense into a few words, and which perhaps therefore—as Luke seems to show—they have placed by anticipation in the nocturnal examination.² Nevertheless, Luke is neither the oldest nor the most exact source: his nocturnal imprisonment in the court is not historical; instead of two examinations, he gives but one; and his account of the morning examination does not exhibit quite the fidelity of his predecessors' report of the nocturnal examination. In brief, the smoother and more plausible report is not the most original. On the other hand, the nocturnal examination of Matthew and Mark is genuinely Sadducean, therefore also genuinely historical. For here all the details fit together—hot haste of the decision, to which everything else also points, swift collection and eclectic composition of the tribunal, adroit questioning, hastily determined harshness of the sentence; and out of all this well-known incisiveness and energy of the party that was far superior to the Pharisees in action, there started forth a fact accomplished in the night, a sudden clearing

¹ Luke xxii. 55 sqq., 63, 66.

² *Sanh.* c. 4, 1: *judicia capitalia transigunt interdin et finiunt interdin.* Comp. also Sohar and Maimon. *Sanh.* in Lightfoot, pp. 383 sq., 462; Schöttgen, p. 400; Friedl. p. 95. The morning Sanhedrim, in Luke xxii. 66; night and morning Sanhedrim, in Matt., Mark. Yet Bleek, II. p. 437 (after Paulus, Schleierm., Strauss, Neander, Krabbe), has preferred Luke. Volkmar, p. 558, does not believe in the Sanhedrim, since Jesus was executed by the Romans only as a rebel; if there was a meeting of the Sanhedrim, however, then it was in the morning, according to Luke. On the other hand, Aberle, p. 20, more correctly finds that Luke made the alteration, because a night sitting in the mere house of the high-priest was held to be illegal.

of the whole of the sultry sky, leaving for the morning Sanhedrim no need of further discussion, but only of a hurried approbation and ratification of the conclusion arrived at.¹ Of course it is hereby maintained that the nocturnal examination was by no means a mere preliminary inquiry, as has recently been so often asserted, but, as the sources themselves give it, a formal and definitive judgment.² The possibility of bringing such a court together in the middle of the night is rendered indisputable by the fact that the high-priest could have invited the judges at the time of sending forth the bailiffs, or at least immediately after the bringing in of Jesus, a procedure which is the less surprising since the messengers who called the whole Sanhedrim to meet in the early morning had to hurry from house to house in the middle of the night. The most reliable and to some extent also the most illustrious of the judges, as well as the witnesses already selected, would therefore be summoned by express messengers to appear at once at Caiaphas' house. A third of the Sanhedrim, twenty-three judges, sufficed to give validity to the decisions of the court.³ The place of sitting,

¹ This reminds one of Jos. *Ant.* 20, 9, 1 (on the occasion of the trial of James): οἵπερ (Sadd.) εἰσὶ περὶ τ. κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδ. (φαρ. πρὸς τ. κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσι, 13, 10, 6). *B.J.* 2, 8, 14: Σαδδ. πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον. ἐπιμυξίαι ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους. *Ant.* 18, 1, 4: οὐκ ἀνεκτοὶ πλήθεσι. The younger Annas, 20, 9, 1: θρασὺς τὸν τρόπον κ. τολμητὴς διαφερόντως. Comp. Eleazar, son of Ananias, and governor of the temple, *νεανίας θρασύτατος*, *B.J.* 2, 17, 2. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 239. See also above, I. pp. 358 sqq.

² The former, Paulus (only a court of inquiry), and Bleck, II. p. 437. Weisse, Meyer, Steinm. more correctly: only a closing deliberation in the morning.

³ Matt. xxvi. 57 has an assembly of the γραμμ. and πρεσβ. at Caiaphas's (verse 59: συν. ὄλον); Mark xiv. 53, incorrectly magnifying, has πάντες οἱ ἀρχ. κ. οἱ πρεσβ. κ. οἱ γραμμ. The number twenty-three, Maimon. *Sanh.* c. 3: cum necesse est, ut congregentur omnes, congregentur omnes.—Non deficiat quid de numero viginti trium considentium continuo per totum tempus sessionis. If one must go, he is to take note whether there are twenty-three, the minimum necessary number, present. Lightfoot, pp. 462, 669. According to Jost. *Gesch. d. Judenth.* I. pp. 280 sqq., 403 sqq., many thought of a (even definitive) sentence by the high-priests, with certain arbitrarily convoked Sanhedrists. See, on the other hand, Wies. *Beitr.* p. 282. Schenkel (p. 292) thinks of the sitting of a committee of those upon whom reliance could be placed; Weizs. (p. 564) of a section of the Sanhedrim under Annas. The question of the Sanhedrim will be more minutely considered in connection with the morning sitting.

however, could be changed, and the Sadducean Annases had in their arrogance often used their own houses for this purpose.¹

According to the Gospels, it may have been about 3 a.m. when the high-priest opened the assembly which had been hurriedly brought together.² For a report of this assembly we are entirely dependent upon the two or three older sources; the Johannine notice is, as will be seen, not probable, and the late Jewish account is fabulous.³ Fortunately the contribution of those earlier sources, Matthew and Mark in particular, is as to contents and form decidedly trustworthy and consistent with its subject, and is as concise as it is dignified; while the objection that not one of Jesus' adherents, not even John, was present, is deprived of its force by the fact that these proceedings, in the loquacious East, would not long remain secret, even though Joseph of Arimathea, or Nicodemus, the so-called lords of the council, was not in a position as eye-witness to make an immediate and a most minute report to the disciples.⁴

The transaction itself was not wanting in that degree of propriety and legality which was preserved in the reign of terror of the later zealots, and which in the existing condition of things was

¹ Comp. the changes of place, Lightfoot, pp. 142, 462. Allusive passage in *Bab. Mez.* f. 88, 1 (*Hier. Ber.* f. 16, 1): quare vastatæ sunt tabernæ filiorum, Hannæ triennio ante excid. Jerus.? Quia facta sua stabilierunt super verba legis. Lightfoot, p. 409. Comp. Grätz, III. p. 493 (where mention is made especially of negligence as to the tithes).

² The basis of the calculation is partly the ending of the Passover-meal before midnight (above, p. 1), partly the retarded arrest in Gethsemane, partly the cock-crowing (3 a.m., not midnight, as Mark gives, above, p. 7), and the denial by Peter, which certainly is mentioned by Matthew and Mark after the transaction in the Sanhedrim, but only on account of the importance attaching to that denial. In Luke the denial is previously narrated, naturally because the Sanhedrim does not meet until the morning; in John the first denial occurs before the examination by Annas, the second and third after Jesus is delivered up to Caiaphas. Ewald (p. 512) fixes the arrest at midnight, Pressensé (p. 611) at early dawn. Caspari (p. 195) fixes the nocturnal examination at the cock-crowing, about 3 a.m.

³ John xviii. 19. The Jewish fable, Lightfoot, p. 371. Renan, 15th ed. p. 407, and Caspari, p. 157. Comp. below. Recent critics, from Neander to Ewald, Renan, Weizs., have arranged a more or less arbitrary combination of the Synoptic and Johannine reports.

⁴ In a similar way are also the proceedings of the Sanhedrim against Stephen questioned by Zeller. On John, above, p. 38, n. 1.

found to be natural.¹ But these Sadducean leaders were masters of form as well as of law-resembling illegality. As in the ordinary sittings in the temple, which were imitated as closely as possible, the judges would sit in a semicircle upon cushions or carpets with their legs crossed. The high-priest sat in the middle, and the most influential and the wisest at his side.² The accused stood before the high-priest, and was at first guarded against any ill-treatment. To the right and left of the crescent were the two clerks of acquittal and condemnation. There were also servants of the court, or lictors, with cords and thongs, to guard the prisoner, to call in the witnesses, and ultimately to execute the sentence.³ The court now dealt with something more than opinions and mere "persuasions."⁴ The principal means of testing all accusations, the ancient Mosaic examination of witnesses, was employed vigorously and copiously; in fact it is impossible to avoid receiving a favourable impression, since the witnesses contradict one another and are therefore not altogether the mere supporters of a conspiracy, while the judges hasten from evidence to evidence and refuse to be satisfied by any, and are therefore not disposed to endorse every lie.⁵ But together with all this, how many traces there are of a false and frivolous trial with a certain end in view, of a trial which, as the Gospels openly say, was directed towards obtaining a capital verdict—"the irony of a judgment."⁶ We see no accuser,

¹ Comp. Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4.

² M. *Sanh.* c. 4, 3: *synedrium instar horrei dimidiati fuit orbiculare, ut unus alterum contueri posset.* *Ketub.* c. 12: *Nasi erat medius, ad dextram pater senatus (ab bet din), ad lævam sapiens, qui tertius dignitate erat.* Friedl. p. 12. Comp. also Lightfoot, pp. 194, 773. The high-priest sat, Mark xiv. 60. *Εἰς μέσον, ib.* So did the accused, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4. Friedl. (p. 87) infers from 1 Kings xxi. 9 that the accused stood on an elevated position.

³ See the references in Friedl. pp. 44, 87 sq. The servants, Mark xiv. 65; comp. Matt. v. 25.

⁴ At the trial of Zacharias, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4: *ἦν δὲ οὔτε ἑλεγχός τις τ. κατηγορουμένων οὔτε τεκμήριον, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ πεπεῖσθαι καλῶς ἔφασαν κ. τοῦτ' εἶναι πίστιν τ. ἀληθείας ἡξίου.*

⁵ Numbers xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15 sqq. Comp. Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1. The witnesses in this trial, Matt. xxvi. 59 sq.

⁶ Matt. xxvi. 59. Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4 (Zacharias): *τὸ σχῆμα κ. τ. εἰρωνείαν τ. δίκαστηρίου μέχρι τέλους πᾶσαι προαιρούμενοι.* The violation of legal forms has very

for the judge is also the accuser; we see only accusing witnesses, zealously brought forward by the judge himself, but not a single witness for the defence, though on other occasions such were on principle preferred. The accused was allowed, nay, was strongly urged, to answer; but no counsel for the defence was given him; there was no *Baal Rib* at his side, and he was vouchsafed no opportunity of calling counter-witnesses. In the conduct of the trial, things were at once made to take a direction against the accused, and the milder practice was not followed of first raising those points which would be in his favour. The accusing witnesses themselves—with whom Judas, from a sense of propriety, was not associated—were too urgently in request to have been previously tested as to their admissibility, or to have been previously cautioned against untruthfulness and reminded of the punishment of it, as was the custom in such cases. Indeed, if we were willing to give more heed to Mark than to Matthew, we could find it probable that the witnesses were contemporaneously in the hall and merely stood up to give their evidence, instead of having been, according to rule, separately called and examined in the order of their age, beginning at the oldest.¹ This injustice, committed against Jesus, has been recognized by the late Jewish fable, and corrected by the false assertion that, in spite of a proclamation by heralds for the space of forty days, not a single witness to the innocence of Jesus presented himself.²

often occurred on Jewish ground. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* I. pp. 280 sqq., 403 sqq. (also comp. Friedl., Langen, Kirchner, &c.).

¹ Accusers (*κατηγοροί*), Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4. Acts vi. 11. Witnesses for the defence, any one allowed to bring counter-evidence, *Sanh.* f. 40, 1; 32, 1. Friedl. p. 89. Counsel for defence, *ib.* p. 87. The mild practice, *Sanh.* c. 4: in judiciis de capite incipiat a transactione circa impune dimittendum eum, qui judicio sistitur et non incipiat ab iis, quæ ad condemnandum faciunt. Lightfoot, p. 462. *Sanh.* f. 32, 1: ordiuntur judicia capit. a parte defensoria et non a parte accusatoria. Omnibus licuit pro p. def. agere, non omnibus licuit pro acc. One says (f. 40, 1): habeo, quo eum accusem: silentium ei indicunt. At scholaris aliquis dicit: habeo, quo eum defendam, ad se ipsos eum evocant atque inter se collocant. Lightfoot, p. 669. Testing and cautioning of witnesses, Lightfoot, pp. 382 sq.; Wetst. p. 526; Friedl. pp. 88 sq. The witnesses in Mark xiv. 57; on the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 60.

² Above, I. p. 23.

According to that fable, the verdict was by no means precipitated; evidence of the innocence of the accused was sought for, but in vain. The judicial murder could not be more eloquently endorsed than by this apology.

Notwithstanding all these flagrant acts of injustice, the end sought was not easily attained. The accusation, whether it had been already formulated or not, charged Jesus—as Luke at least expressly says in narrating what afterwards occurred before Pilate—with seducing the people by false teaching.¹ Jesus was a *mesith*, an inciter to disobedience to the Mosaic ordinances, a criminal designation copiously used by the Talmud.² But the many witnesses, who were to have proved the offence, gave evidence some of which was of insufficient importance, and much more of which was—as Mark in particular shows—contradictory.³ The Talmud says: “When their words are found to agree, their testimony is firm.”⁴ Sayings of Jesus at Jerusalem were certainly adduced. The Messianic entry was evidently avoided, because Jesus had not distinctly given his own opinion concerning it, although they might induce him to express himself as to the ovations of his adherents. The expulsion of the sellers out of the sanctuary was also allowed to rest, because if they could condemn the presumption of the act, they could not condemn the sentiment. But there were many things to be laid hold of in the utterances at Jerusalem, in the first utterances for instance,

¹ Luke xxiii. 2 (διαστρέφων τὸ ἔθνος); verse 5: ἀνασείει τ. λαόν. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 64 (later hand), πλάνη. Also John vii. 12.

² Mesit, Bux. p. 1454 (massit, Jer. xliii. 3) = seducer. Comp. above, I. p. 23; Lightfoot, p. 562; Renan, 15th ed. p. 406.

³ Only Matt. and Mark speak of witnesses, which Weisse (p. 454) also admits. Luke mentions witnesses in the trial of Stephen (Acts vi. 13), but not of Jesus. But his account is here generally very compendious; in John witnesses would have no meaning. Matt. xxvi. 60: πολλοί; Mark xiv. 56: οὐκ ἴσαι μαρτυρίαί (Talm. edut bethelah = inane, Lightfoot, p. 461).

⁴ *Rosh hash.* 2, 6: si verba eorum inveniuntur convenientia, testimonium eorum est firmum. Friedl. p. 89. On the technical expressions as to the force and nullity of evidence, testimon. inane, test. stans (admissum), constans (congruens), pseudo-martyrium (szomemim, cogitantes mala), Lightfoot, pp. 461 sq., 383. These categories themselves show the generally prevalent exactitude.

and also in the last. For the Jewish tales of the results of a secret overhearing of Jesus by two disciples of the wise in the walls of a house, is to be rejected as ludicrous.¹ If the great closing attack upon the Pharisees was not mentioned, because it was agreeable to the party spirit of the Sadducees, on the other hand the strong earlier-uttered invectives against the hierarchy as a whole afforded a rich mine of accusations.² Unfortunately the separate points of evidence have not been preserved; but that many of the charges were based upon misunderstanding or distortion must be believed, not only because the Gospels speak of false witnesses in language which is something more than an Old Testament colouring, nor merely because of the contradiction of the witnesses, but particularly because of the fact that Jesus' wise utterance about the payment of tribute, an utterance to which no blame could attach, was subsequently used before Pilate as a ground of accusation.³ For some time the evidence afforded so little that was certain, weighty, or incriminating, that the chiefs of the tribunal—such a lack of detailed examination and testing had there been—were in perplexity, and did not once appeal to Jesus for an answer to the charges. But the case took a turn, for this evidence was brought forward: "I testify that Jesus said he could destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days,"—a sublime and forcible utterance against Jewish temple-veneration and religious drowsiness, and an utterance the essential genuineness of which, notwithstanding the conflicting testimony of the Gospels and the subtle explana-

¹ *Hier. Sanh.* f. 25, 4: statuunt ei in insidiis duos testes in domo interiori illumque in exteriori collocant, accensa juxta eum lucerna, ut eum videant audiantque. Sic actum est cum ben Satda in Lydda. Collocarunt ei in insidiis duos disc. sapientum eumque adduxerunt ad synedrium et lapidarunt. Lightfoot, p. 371. Renan and Caspari believe in such a foolish thing, as if it were not enough for Grätz seriously to reproduce it, III. p. 242.

² Steinm. pp. 121 sq. explains why Sabbath-breaking and the performance of miracles were not brought forward.

³ False witnesses, Matt. xxvi. 59 sq.; Mark xiv. 56 sq. Falsehoods before Pilate, Luke xxiii. 2. Volkmar, p. 583, thought of the Old Testament, Ps. xxvii. 12; but even Mark, in xiv. 57 (Matt. xxvi. 60), did not think of ἐπ'ἀνίστησάν μοι μάρτυρες ἄδικοι κ. ἐψεύσατο ἡ ἀδικία αὐτοῦ.

tion of the fourth Gospel, has been above already admitted.¹ The witness claimed to have been an ear-witness, and he was incited to "tell all that thou hast heard!" A second, or indeed a third, witness confirmed the assertion with, "I heard the same." And so little was there of that serious contradiction between these accusers of which Mark erroneously speaks, that the high-priest, when he found this evidence corroborated and the attack upon the temple, upon the holiest thing that Israel possessed, proved, was satisfied, and with ostentatious zeal springing up from his seat addressed to Jesus the question: "Answerest thou nothing to what these testify against thee?"² Yet Jesus remained silent, thus being altogether different from his Apostle Paul, or from Zachariah the son of Baruch, who in the beginning of the Jewish war by his vigorous rebuke tore in pieces the terrible network of

¹ Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 57; John ii. 19. The utterance is confirmed by Matt. xxiv. 2; Acts vi. 14 (comp. above, V. pp. 129 sq., 190). The situation in John must be rejected; Ewald thinks the old utterance is here served up again (p. 565); Gess, p. 6, says: the Synoptical utterance, made to refer to the domain of religion, would be boastful! Bleek, II. p. 442, finds that John has the most correct expression: the Jews, not Jesus, were to destroy. Thus already Paulus. The addition in Mark, ἀχρεῖς, is, according to almost universal consent (Bleek, II. p. 442), a gloss of the author's, perhaps after Acts vii. 48, or 2 Cor. v. 1, *perhaps* a correct one. Volkmar (p. 585) thinks that Matthew struck out, as questionable, this word, which, however, would not be pertinent until after the resurrection, and which was by Mark the poet used of the new temple of Christianity; and that Luke lent it to Stephen. Most critics believe in the historical character of the passage as a whole, comp. Weisse, p. 454; Weizs. p. 565; Schenkel, p. 292; Hausr. p. 447. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 315, 467, questions simply the three days, which however are to be understood as a Hebraicism, Jesus being fond of speaking thus, above, IV. p. 274. Volkmar rejects the passage. A ground of suspicion against the passage might be found in the Jewish expectation that the Messiah would build the temple afresh, *Bemidb.* 14. Cant. 4, 16. Massech. Soph. 21, 2: tertium tempore Messie, Wetst. p. 525; also Hausr. p. 447; whence it may be assumed that the Christians saw this temple brought into existence by the resurrection of Jesus, as Mark gives (comp. Barn. 4). But the witnesses, the passage itself, and the analogous expressions of Jesus, are against the supposition of invention. The meaning most likely is, (1) the temple falls with the rejection of the Messiah; (2) a new, not exactly purely spiritual, but simpler temple ordinance begins with the Messianic age. Recent critics either undecided or radical. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. p. 391: attack upon the Jewish religious system. Schenkel, p. 292: declaration of war in the sense of the Christian Church.

² *Sanh.* c. 7: loquere plane, quid audivisti. *Macc.* c. 1, 1: testamur nos de N., quod. . . . *Sanh.* 7, 5: dein secundus tertiusque dicit: ego idem, quod ille audivi. Lightfoot, p. 383; Wetst. p. 526. The high-priest, Matt. xxvi. 62.

his foes' intrigues. And Jesus was greater, more self-conscious, more royal in his silence than when he answered, though it was at the risk of having his silence construed as assent.¹ He looked down upon and despised his foes. He was willing to allow violence and falsehood to take their course. He knew that his explanation of the utterance, which was a pearl before swine, would not be either understood or rightly appreciated by these hearers; he knew further that the failure of one accusation would be followed by a second accusation and finally by the eagerly longed-for condemnation.²

According to the legal forms, the high-priest could here close the inquiry and collect the votes. Thus indeed have the later Jewish sources closed the trial of Jesus with the evidence of the witnesses.³ Yet Caiaphas was anxious to extort a confession from the accused, in order fully to justify the verdict. The silence of the remarkable and—in his very reticence—imposing prisoner might itself have been a strong provocation, but Caiaphas wished to have a public proof of the mysterious crime which no witness had disclosed, to which even the enigmatical utterance pointed only from afar, of which moreover Jerusalem and all the country were talking, and before even which Roman contradiction was dumb—the Messiahship. As one who understood human nature, the great “serpent” of the house of An̄nas, he hoped to see this publicly attested by the free confession of the man who, though proudly silent before the torturing witnesses, was sensitively candid when put upon his honour, and could live

¹ Matt. xxvi. 62; Mark xiv. 60 sq.; comp. Luke xxii. 67. Zachariah, Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4.

² The drying-up of the inexhaustible source of speech is finely referred to in Just. *Trypho*, 102 (ἐποχή ἰσχυροῦ λόγου). Schleierm. p. 429: declaration of the nothingness of all that was said; make ye of it what ye will; preparedness for death. De Wette: contempt. Renan, 15th ed. p. 410: they only sought pretexts. Strauss: he did not recognize the tribunal. Steinm. pp. 119 sqq.: the falsehood destroys itself, and Jesus makes room for the government of God. Strauss (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 344) and Volkmar (p. 584) question this silence as based upon Is. liii. 7. But where is the improbability? And did not Jesus afterwards speak? And was not the high-priest driven, by this very silence, to put the final question?

³ See above, p. 47.

and die enthusiastically conscious and jealous of the great idea of his life.¹ He therefore appealed directly to the candour and the faith of Jesus, speaking of course in the Aramaic language, according to the custom of the Jews and of the Jewish tribunals: "If thou art the Messiah, tell us!" And he was not mistaken; Jesus now spoke, at first deprecatingly, then freely: "If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask, ye will not answer."² This answer, in every respect apposite and probable, has been preserved by Luke. Pleased to have obtained an answer, and sure that the negation must be followed by an affirmation, the high-priest at once, in a solemn tone, with a loud voice, and with an appeal to God as witness, put an urgent second question: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God!"³ In the face of such an appeal to the holy God made by the mouth of the "high-priest of God," whom men were to obey as God, Jesus could not longer be reticent, though to speak would be to run the risk of signing his own death-warrant. He owed it to himself, to the truth, to

¹ "Serpent's hiss of the house of Annas," *Tos. Men.* in Hausr. p. 66. Aberle, p. 23, thinks the insistence upon a confession was an overstepping of the law (but comp. Joshua vii. 19; Acts v. 8), and Jesus' voluntary answer.

² Luke xxii. 66 sq. Jesus had followed this system of defence in Jerusalem from the first, Matt. xxi. 23 sq.

³ Matt. xxvi. 63. Similarly Joshua against Achan, Joshua vii. 19; Ahab against the prophet Micah, 1 Kings xxii. 16. Mark xiv. 61 has no adjuration, but only the very temperate question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed (habaruch, Rom. ix. 5; Schöttgen, p. 544=God)?" To this Jesus would certainly not have answered so solemnly. According to Aberle (p. 24), Mark wished, by omitting the adjuration, to screen the neophytes to whom the Jews often scoffingly held up the "living God"! Luke xxii. 66 sq. has the two-fold question of the Sanhedrists (the high-priest is not mentioned)—(a) "Art thou the Christ?" upon which Jesus is said to have given the answer mentioned above, and then to have added: "From henceforth shall the Son of Man," &c.; (b) "They all cry, Thou therefore art the Son of God?" upon which Jesus answers: "Ye say that (not, Ye say it because) I am." Luke is right as to the repetition of the question in a heightened form, and also as to the first answer of Jesus (see above); in other respects he is secondary partly in Jesus' premature reference to his seat in heaven, a reference which weakens everything and, as following the immediately preceding reticence, is very clumsily introduced, and partly in the form and contents of the second question and answer. According to Aberle (p. 26), Luke omits the "Son of God," because such would have been legitimate among the Gentiles, and Nero would not have tolerated a condemnation on that ground!

God, to drop the veil with which he had so carefully covered himself since the Messianic proclamation at the source of the Jordan.¹ "Thou hast said it!" Into that brief utterance he condensed a world of confession.² Then, deprecating and menacing the unbelief which would necessarily gather with scornful laughter round his head, and which would imprison the truth within the material show, and put his Messiahship to shame by pointing to the wretched appearance of his helplessness, he solemnly added: "Nevertheless I say unto you, henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven!"³

That this great confession, this protestation of mere words, but at the same time of unyielding, victorious, spiritual conviction, was actually spoken by Jesus, and was not fabricated by the Church as what he would probably have said, might at once be inferred from the unanimity of the Gospels, which loses nothing by the trifling divergence of Luke as to the position of this utterance. But we shall also find that Jesus, in the sublimest moment and in circumstances which cried "No," could not be satisfied with a simple "Yes," particularly as he had previously found the simple "Yes" to awaken suspicion. Nor would the high-priest and the assembly have been roused

¹ Acts xxiii. 4. Jos. *Ap.* 2, 23: ὡς εἰς τ. Θεὸν αὐτὸν ἀσεβῶν.

² The best is Matt. xxvi. 64, comp. 25: σὺ εἶπας (ant' amarta). Very usual Jewish form of affirmation with omission of the person of the one who is asked: vos dixistis! Examples in Schöttgen, p. 225. Luke xxii. 70: ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι, an equivocal utterance which is intended either to remove from Jesus the assertion of his Messiahship (thus Marcion, Tert. *Con. Marc.* 4, 41: vos dicitis, quasi non ego), or to strengthen it by the admission of the opponents themselves (Matt. xxi. 31, 41). Finally, Mark xiv. 62 has the direct and strong affirmative confession, ἐγὼ εἶμι (from Luke), which afterwards (see above, p. 34) played so great a rôle. Steinmeyer (p. 125) asserts that Jesus confessed and did not swear; what a man is, that cannot he swear!

³ Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69. Similarly James, in Eus. 2, 23. Weizs.'s incorrect exposition, below, p. 52, n. 2. It is to be noted, (a) Mark has μετὰ, more exactly after Dan. vii. 13 (in anane shemaja, LXX. μετὰ, Matt. ἐπὶ), see above, IV. p. 288, note 2; (b) Mark has erased ἀπάσιν (Luke, ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥῶν); (c) Luke has erased the ὥσπερ and the coming with clouds. Moreover, Luke, by distinguishing between the two questions (above, p. 50, n. 3), has unskilfully connected this answer of Jesus with the first question. On the right hand of power, limin hageburah, Ps. cx. 1. Buxt. p. 385.

to an expression of horror, if there had not preceded the majestically grand confession by which Jesus, out of his most intimate faith, maintained the claim of the Messiahship that apparently lay in ruins.¹

The high-priest understood the words of Daniel and of the Psalmist. He saw the pretensions of this Messiahship first soaring to the throne of God and then in enthusiastic haste returning again from heaven to earth, whilst the earth refused it any standing-ground.² His mind had not for a moment been in doubt concerning a Messiahship which in every form, even under a better representation, appeared to him to be deception or enthusiasm, and the titles assumed by which, the divine sonship in particular, he took upon his lips only with hesitation and fear. But in view of this unheard-of assumption, he was no longer able to maintain the cool and prudent calm which the Sadducees were not wont to lose in the presence of human follies.

¹ Renan thinks (15th ed. pp. 409 sq.) that Jesus was silent to this question. Weisse, p. 454: simply, Yes! The rest not skilfully placed here! Volkmar, pp. 584, 588: if Jesus was questioned, it was only, "Son of God?" and not, "Christ?" Luke would take offence at that (at most he took offence at Jesus' calling himself Messiah)! This is of course dependent upon Volkmar's notion of the invention of the Messiah-Christ name by Peter. As to the Jews, there is more proof that they shrank from the name of "Son of God" than that they shrank from that of "Messiah" (Origen, *Con. Cel.* 1, 49; 2, 31; Hilg. *Er.* p. 294). But, he adds, Jesus would then have been obliged to say: "I am, but in a different sense from what you think, as leader of the kingdom of the Spirit" (= John!). On the other hand, the question, "Son of God?" he would have been able to answer affirmatively. As if both were not the same! "But who guarantees this transaction?" Even here Mark has no prosaic biography, but the accusation of Christendom and Christ before the Jewish tribunal! On the other hand, it is well known that Strauss, in 4th ed. II. p. 468, and *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 391 sq., has deliberately refrained from attacking this account. See, generally, above, IV. p. 288.

² Dan. vii. 13; Ps. cx. 1 (Matt. xxii. 44). Also Ps. viii. 4 sqq. Tert., *Con. Marc.* 4, 41, already found both: *suggerebat se ex Danielis prophetia filium hominis et e psalmo David sedentem ad dexteram Dei*. The coming on the clouds of heaven was understood by Neander, Krabbe, De Wette, Meyer, Schenkel, figuratively, particularly in view of the *ἀνάπτε*, as the continuous exercise of power upon earth. Comp. also Gess, p. 178. Steinm. p. 128. But Bleek (II. p. 444) gives a different explanation; adding, like Olsh., that *ἀνάπτε* belongs only to the sitting, not to the coming, which would not be possible until later at the return of Christ. This is arbitrary, as has been previously shown. Weizsäcker's explanation (p. 565) that Jesus, by pointing to the future, declined an actual (political) raising of a standard, is also arbitrary.

His passion burst forth, not as ordinary anger or scorn or pity ; it burst forth with almost unparalleled energy, and in truth had no appearance of religion, of zeal for God, of pious horror. Full of sorrow and of abhorrence, as if the judgment of God must descend upon the criminal and upon Jerusalem, he sprang up from his seat, rent his fine-linen priestly robe (the official robes were worn only at the feasts, four times in the year), as was customary when blasphemy was uttered, bared his breast, and cried with a loud, yet quivering and faltering voice : " He has spoken blasphemy !¹ What further need have we of witnesses ? Behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy ! What think ye ?"²

It was not in an assumed, overpowering amazement, but in full conviction, that with these words he called for a vote. And they neither deliberated nor voted.³ The impression produced upon all the judges was the same, though they did not also hasten to rend their garments.⁴ The question was decided by

¹ Matt. xxvi. 65 and par. passages. Religious ceremoniousness of the Sadducees, comp. Jos. *Ant.* 19, 6, 4. Avoidance of the name "Son of God," see above, p. 52, n. 1. Blasphemer, because he made himself equal to God, Levit. xxiv. 16 ; Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 6 ; Matt. ix. 3. The rending of garments on account of sorrow and religious indignation, Gen. xxxvii. 34 ; Numb. xiv. 6 ; 2 Sam. i. 11 ; 2 Kings xviii. 37 (to which the Rabbis have recourse) ; 1 Macc. xi. 71 ; Acts xiv. 14 ; Jos. *B. J.* 2, 15, 4 (also high-priests, although the practice was forbidden to them, Levit. x. 6, xxi. 10). The splendid official robes (generally in the custody of the Romans, and delivered up seven days before the feast) were worn by the high-priest only in the temple at the three feasts and on the Day of Atonement ; on other occasions he wore the customary priestly garment, Jos. *Ant.* 18, 4, 3 ; Acts xxiii. 5. The priestly garment, however (Ketonet, *χιτών*, *λίανον ἐνδύμα διπλῆς σινδόνης βυσσίνης*, *Ant.* 3, 7, 2), was worn in every-day life (*ib.* and the Rabbis). Matt. speaks of *ἱμάτια* (any clothing, under and over garment, comp. xxvii. 35 ; John xix. 23) ; Mark, more definitely, of *χιτῶνες* (on *χιτῶν*, however, see *sadon*, shirt). The rules of rending the garments for blasphemy, see Lightfoot, pp. 53, 383 ; Schöttgen, p. 234 ; Wetst. p. 526 ; Friedl. p. 92. Standing up, non-repairing of garments, every one's duty to rend the garments, for the witnesses only at the first hearing, *ib.* Baring of the breast, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 15, 4. Paulus' position, that the high-priest tore open his priestly dress as if it were too strait for him (*L. J.* p. 217), is to be judged by the preceding sentences. Schenkel (p. 295) also supposes a serious indignation.

² Chiefly after Matt. and Mark ; Luke xxii. 71 less exact.

³ Contrary to Acts iv. 15, v. 40.

⁴ *Mæd. Katon*, f. 26, 1 : tradunt rabbini nostri, tum eum, qui blasphem. audivit, tum eum, qui ab audiente relatum audivit, vestes scindere oportere ; sed testes non tenentur scindere (since scissura perpetua was not demanded of them), Schöttgen, p. 234.

acclamation: "He is deserving of death."¹ For, according to the ancient law, blasphemy to the extent of making paltry man equal to God was punishable by death. We may to-day quash such a verdict. Whether we are Christians or not, we know that Jesus' Messianic confession of the filial relationship to God has been the watchword of a new religion, of a higher view of the universe. But we must admit that the doctrine of the God-likeness, of the God-fellowship, of human nature, which was embodied in the person of Jesus, was not the confession of Mosaism, not the belief of these Scribes.² For this aggressive and innovating confession, Jesus, like other though lesser heroes of the truth, was condemned in good faith by the men of the old school. They had instituted a tendency-trial with bad means; but on the ground of his own voluntary confession, the daring character of which was no longer counterbalanced by the influence of his

¹ Matt. xxvi. 66: *ἔροχος θανάτου* (ish mavet, rasha lamut, Numb. xxxv. 31). Less definite, Mark xiv. 64, and especially Luke xxii. 71. The collection of votes (in writing, Lightfoot, p. 384) and the declaration, "Guilty" (Friedlieb, p. 89), were dispensed with. They passed over this form the more readily because the blasphemy (Levit. xxiv. 16) was so conspicuous. Comp. also *M. Sanh.* c. 7: blasphemus non tenetur, nisi expressit nomen; Jesus had often publicly mentioned nomen Dei. I cannot assume Matt. xxvi. 65 sq. to be independent of the somewhat similar passage, Jer. xxvi. 11 (comp. Volk. p. 583): *κρίσις θανάτου τῷ ἀνθρ. τοῦτῳ, ὅτι ἐπροφήτ. κατὰ τ. πόλεως, καθὼς ἤκουσ. ἐν τοῖς ὡσὶν ἡμῶν.*

² Comp. above, III. pp. 72 sqq. As a rule, the "conscienceless" Sanhedrim is too harshly condemned (comp. Neander, p. 562; Ewald, p. 563; Weizs. p. 565), naturally most of all by the dogmatism that sees no political crime (thus above) in the Messianic confession, or that sees in Jesus simply the incarnation of God; and, on the other hand, the Jewish historians rightly take a different attitude. According to Salvador, *Hist. d. Institut. d. Moyse*, II. pp. 81 sqq., and Abraham Geiger (*Lügnische Hoffnungen*, p. 121), Jesus was justly condemned; according to Grätz, III. pp. 244 sq., the appearance at any rate was against Jesus; he was the victim of a misunderstanding. On the Christian side, the Fragmentist decides that Jesus met with his deserts, after the attempted rising; and Goethe's distich justifies the cross of the fanatic (Tholuck, p. 48). Schleierm. (p. 427) is at least fair towards the condemnation of a Messiah, on the ground of the fact that prophecy was held to be closed, and among the Sadducees there were doubts as to the coming of a Messiah. Renan (15th ed. p. 410): from the standpoint of orthodox Judaism there was nothing to be said, but from that of a higher. Similarly Hase, p. 249; Schenkel, p. 295. On the Jewish side, Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* I. pp. 280 sqq., 403 sqq., shows the most moderate verdict, one indeed almost too unfavourable to his own people: he speaks of the violation of all legal forms, even of private murder by the foes of Jesus. Comp. Kirchner, p. 62.

person, they closed the trial with sincere and strong conviction. And if one pities them for their defective perception of the things which take place between heaven and earth, yet it should not be overlooked that the new truth had struck them only in fragments, and at places which were protected against the pure impression. We can least of all deny that the combination of this great perception with the person of Jesus, especially the person of a poor prisoner who boasted of his rights and privileges and even of the throne of God, would seem impossible to all those who were not in a condition to overcome the obstacle of human eyes and of Jewish ideas by a presentient faith inspired by reliance upon the Son of Man.

The passionate mood excited by the closing appeal, and the sentence of condemnation against Jesus—although the latter was not definitive—put an end at once to the dignity of the assembly, and lawlessness and mishandling of Jesus commenced. It was the rule to mourn fasting on the rare days on which capital verdicts were pronounced.¹ But on this occasion honourable Sanhedrists, and particularly the externally courteous but inwardly brutal Sadducees, did not control the impulses of their Oriental blood. They threw themselves upon Jesus, some with violent anger, others with scoffing: "Be not afraid of him," Moses had said to them.² Some, full of anger and of abhorrence, spat in his face and buffeted him; others smote him with the flat hand upon his mouth and said derisively: "Prophecy unto us, Messiah, who it is, what is his name, who smites thee?"³

¹ *Bab. Sanh.* f. 63, 1: Cum synedrium quemquam morti adjudicavit, ne quidquam degustent illi isto die. Lightfoot, p. 383. The general mildness of the Sanhedrim, *ib.* pp. 370, 664.

² Deut. xviii. 22; comp. Judas, above, V. p. 298. On the other hand, Grätz, p. 245: no passionate hatred!

³ Matt. xxvi. 67 sq., comp. Luke xxii. 63; Mark xiv. 65. The word *ῥαπίζω* has been translated, in It. Vulg., *palmas in faciem ejus dederunt*. Comp. John xviii. 22, xix. 3; Acts xxiii. 2. Decisive for this translation is Matt. v. 39, as well as the fact that no other meaning can be shown in the New Test. (like *ῥαβδίζω*, 2 Cor. xi. 25), and finally the impossibility of finding in the hands of the Sanhedrists instruments such as are suggested by the original significance of the word (*virgo, baculo* [*ῥαπίς*])

Thus were the hours occupied until the morning sitting. The discovery of the weakness of this Messiah who consoled himself only with the future, and the unchained frenzy of the old religion, destroyed all respect for the man whose word and whose arm had up to that time been feared; nay, this weakness of his was tested and proved.¹ Luke—as well as John—throws the blame of this maltreatment upon the servants, not merely because such gross behaviour seemed to the cultured Greek more appropriate to such than to councillors of good repute, but also because through the whole night he had placed Jesus in the court-yard among the servants. And Mark has, in his usual way, happily united Sanhedrists and servants, who are said to have smitten him with their hands or with rods.² Still less credibility attaches to the amplified statement of these two Evangelists, that, in order to play at prophesying, those who took Jesus indulged in mummeries, and took pains to crown his head in advance.³ The best explanation is that a fulfilment of Old Testament prediction has

cædere). It would have to be assumed that they had taken thongs and rods out of the hands of the servants; but that must have been said. Mark, who as a middle man between Matthew and Luke interpolates servants by whom Jesus was taken into custody with *παῖ*, would rather have been thinking of virgæ. Beza, Bengel, Meyer, Ewald, have, not without reference to Mark, translated *virgis cædere*. That we may credit the Sanhedrists (thus Fr., Mey., De Wette) with this maltreatment, follows from all we know of Orientals and Sadducees (*ὅμοι παρὰ π. τ. Ιουδ.*). Comp. Acts xxi. 32, xxiii. 2 (well attested), and what is remarked on Matt. v. 39, concerning the harsh customs of the Jews, above, III. p. 315. Blows in the face were given which were followed by deafness, Wetst. p. 526. The proclaimer of woe, Jesus the son of Annas, was flogged in the streets by the rulers, Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 3.

¹ *Sanh.* f. 93 b. Probabant contra Barcochebam, Messie cogitationes hominum cognitæ esse. Quod cum non posset, interfecerunt eum, Wetst. p. 357.

² *L.c.* John xviii. 22; in xix. 3 he has Roman soldiers instead of Jewish servants. Here critics have been inclined to prefer Luke. Paulus spoke of guard-room jokes; Schleier. affirmed that Sanhedrists could not be thought of. Not only Bleek and Weisse, even Strauss was favourable to Luke, 4th ed. II. p. 469. Grätz (p. 245) *pro domo* ascribed the maltreatment to the Gentiles alone.

³ Here (Luke, Mark) it is an art not to see (thus even Meyer) that this is an amplification of Matthew's account; on the other hand, Volkmar is disposed to find in the elucidative words of Matthew and Luke (where "Christ" is wanting, *προφ., τις ὁ παῖς. σ.*) a later construction than the "Prophecy!" of Mark, which he holds to be as genuine as it is unintelligible.

been introduced; for these parallels do not—as Strauss also saw—support the assumption of an artificial origin of the rest.¹

In the mean while, in the court-yard among the guard, there was a good deal of stir. In addition to the rejoicings over the successful attack, which cheered the spirits of the company almost more than did the fire round which they were lying, a subject of conversation was found in a disciple of Jesus. A single representative of those disciples, Peter, had followed the crowd of officials at a distance, less in order to verify his brave words to Jesus, than from an involuntary prompting of that love to Jesus which had spoken the bold, unfulfilled utterance itself, and would now, fearing and yet hoping, look upon the issue of all these things.² The fourth Gospel has obscured this fact, out of a very conceivable wish to see its own favourite disciple John represented at this last faint exhibition of love and fidelity. The Gospel adheres to the truth by at least mentioning Peter first, by doubling the courage of the man who dared to show himself in the midst of the foes even after using the sword, and by basing the precedence of John not in the first place upon his greater fidelity. But here, as elsewhere, it departs from the truth by nevertheless giving the impression that John was decidedly superior to Peter. John is bold, nay hero, enough, not only—as the earlier accounts correctly and reasonably narrated—to follow Jesus from a distance, with Peter in close proximity, but afterwards, while Peter remains outside the door of the

¹ The parallel passages, Is. l. 6, liii. 3 sqq. To which I would add 1 Kings xxii. 24; Micah v. 1. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 469. Volkmar, p. 583. Steinm., p. 112, deprecated the parallels because no Gospel referred to them. Strauss would not deny the maltreatment, notwithstanding the model; thus also *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. II. p. 344. Olsh. assumed a factual fulfilment of this prediction. The best parallel is afforded by Is. l. 6: τ. νῶτόν μου ἔδωκα εἰς μάστιγας, τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνῃς ἐμπυτσημάτων. But who does not see that there is nothing to be said of slavish dependence, such as is so natural to artificial constructors? Also see Rom. xv. 3. The blindfolding in Luke and Mark can best be referred back to an incorrect conception of Is. liii. 3, according to the Hebrew (kamaster panim) as well as the Greek text (ἀπιστραπται τ. πρὸς αὐτοῦ).

² Matt. xxvi. 58; Luke xxii. 54; Mark xiv. 54. The μακρόθεν, omitted by John, is in all the rest; only Matt. has ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος.

high-priest's palace, to enter that palace with Jesus as his inseparable bosom disciple. Then he comes out again and procures admission for Peter, he—John—being acquainted with the high-priest and with the maid that kept the door. And finally his fidelity to Jesus remains unstained, but certainly also untested, whilst Peter is no sooner put to the test than he thrice denies his Lord.¹ Here we find the same thing as at the last supper, as at the grave of Jesus, viz., that Peter is represented as being victoriously surpassed by John, his fortunate rival, the inseparable and immaculate friend of the Son of Man. But this characteristic of the Gospel, doubly bad if John as author of the Gospel praises himself, here as everywhere awakens just distrust. Why did the earlier Gospels know nothing of this John?² In what way could John the Galilean be a private friend of the Sadducean high-priest?³ How was it possible that the disciples of an arrested man could closely accompany the dangerous criminal, as if it was all in sport and not in earnestness, as if all had not fled in Gethsemane? Finally, by what miracle could the favourite disciple have succeeded, we will not say in maintaining his fidelity while Peter fell, but in escaping suspicion of discipleship to Jesus, to whom he remained so wonderfully close, a suspicion which brought Peter in danger, whilst he—John—by his acquaintance with the household, secured a protection impossible in the present situation and in the sight of the servants who did not know Peter? From all this it follows that Peter alone retains the renown of a dangerous following “afar off,” as he alone bears the dishonour of the denial.

The four Gospels agree in the essential features of this denial, though they differ widely in many details, wherein the greatest

¹ John xviii. 15 sq.

² Foolish explanations of the “other disciple” as an unknown person (Aug., Calov, Gurlitt), as a citizen of Jerusalem (Grotius), even as Iscariot (Heum.).

³ Ewald (p. 246) revives the old fable of a priestly descent of John himself. And Schleierm. (p. 427) found it possible that John was present at the hearing before Annas, but not at that before Caiaphas (because he narrates nothing of that). Still better Steinm. p. 143.

probability lies on the side of Matthew and in part also of Mark.¹ Peter summoned up courage to enter the court of the high-priest and to lie by the fire near the servants, though not, as Mark describes it, in the midst of them. There he was recognized by a maid of the high-priest's, not exactly by the keeper of the door, as John says. Perhaps this maid had seen him in the temple among those who accompanied Jesus. "Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean!" she said to him.² "I know not what thou sayest," he quickly replied; and at once he became afraid; the company, who began to recognize him, became embarrassing to him; he arose from the fire and retreated to the portal of the palace. This shifting of his place is correctly shown by Matthew and Mark; but, according to Luke, Peter utters three denials while quietly reclining by one and the same fire; and, according to John, he still more inconceivably boldly approaches the fire of the inner court after the first denial made before the maid who kept the door, and there utters the second and third denials—the direct opposite of the earlier accounts. His retreating enabled him to escape further interrogation, as three Gospels show; yet not for long. For his retreat into the portal did not help him; the same maid according to Mark, another according to Matthew, one of the servants according to Luke and John, here attacked him afresh or drew to him the attention of those who were present, and he denied again with the addition of an

¹ We refer only incidentally to the much discussed question whether the denial of Peter occurred in the court of Annas or of Caiaphas. Matthew has definitely, Luke and Mark indefinitely (court of the high-priest), the court of Caiaphas; John places the first denial in the court of Annas, the second and third in that of Caiaphas, xviii. 13, 15—18, 24—27. But he evidently assumes (verses 18, 25) that it is one and the same court, so that the ancient supposition (Euthym., and among recent critics Ebr., Lange, Licht., Hofm., Press., Casp., Steinm.) deserves respect, that Annas and Caiaphas had, according to John at least, a common court-yard or even a common house. On the other hand, Schleierm. and Olsh. place the second and third denial at the departure from Annas to Caiaphas (which is contrary to the text, John xviii. 24, 28); others would simply retain the differences of the Synoptics (Meyer, De Wette, Brückner), and give the preference to John (Paulus, Bleek). As to the succession of the denials, Steinmeyer (p. 113) lays down the neat harmonistic scheme, (1) maid (Matt., Mark), (2) servants by the fire (Luke), (3) the relation of Malchus's (John).

² Comp. *ittanu*, 2 Kings vi. 16; *itti*, ix. 32.

oath. This time he did not escape so easily ; after a little while, after an hour says Luke, those who stood round about, having made themselves sure of their fact by looking at him and whispering to each other, approached him with resolute conviction : "Of a truth, thou art one of them, thou art a Galilean, thy speech betrayeth thee."¹ If we are to believe John, an individual servant, a relation of the man who lost his ear, exposed the blindness of the others by the emphatic third testimony : "Did I not see thee in the garden with him?" As Peter's perplexity increased, so did the despondently determined sinfulness of his denial increase. Oath, self-execration, and cold repudiation of his Master, were now forced all at once from his lips : "I know not the man!"² In the course of a few hours between midnight and morning, perhaps in the course of an hour, had Peter repeatedly—in distrust of the round number we do not say exactly three times—discarded his Master and justified Him alone, not himself.³

Because Jesus spoke of a repeated denial before the cock-crow, that is before daybreak, all the Gospels have connected an actual cock-crowing with the nocturnal history of the disciple, just in the same manner as they have inferred a triple denial by the disciple from the prediction of Jesus.⁴ Scarcely had Peter sinned

¹ The language of the Galileans, above, II. p. 5.

² The strongest expressions are in Matthew and Mark. We will not go further into the trifling differences, as when in Matthew and Mark the three denials form a rapid series, in Luke the first and second are near together and are separated by an hour from the third (Matt., Mark, comp. John, *μετὰ μυχρόν*), and in John the second and third are separated from the first, &c. According to Hilgenfeld, 1868, p. 66, Matt. has lost the fine progressive intensification of the Gospel of the Hebrews (Cod. Tisch. marg.): *ἡνρίψ. κ. ὤμοσεν κ. κατηγοῶσατο*. In reality *all that* stands in Matt.

³ The thrice in the words of Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 34, and in the actual fulfilment, may be questioned, or may in both cases be found credible ; we may prefer to rely upon the words of Jesus, or upon the actual denial in triple form. Meyer assumes, *e.g.*, the latter ; I would rather credit the words of Jesus, comp. above, p. 7. Against the triple denial it may be adduced (comp. similarly the three petitions in Gethsemane) that here the maids and there the servants repeat themselves, and that number two in particular offers nothing fresh. By the addition of all the incidents, Paulus extracted eight denials, and Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 478, holds that perhaps the denial occurred more than thrice.

⁴ Above, p. 7.

the third time, nay, says Luke, he had not finished speaking, when the cock announced the morning. Peter recalled his Master's prediction, being reminded of it, according to Luke, by a glance which Jesus, who was present in the court, threw at the disciple by the fire just as the cock was crowing.¹ According to Mark, the cock—in harmony with the too minutely detailed prediction of Jesus, as given by this author—had crowed twice, at the first and the last denials, about midnight, and then three hours later when the morning was beginning to dawn. The first crowing of the cock had not been noticed by Peter, naturally because it was not until the second, which he heard, that he had consummated his triplet of unfaithfulness. Against the literalness of the cock-crowing, which the Gospels in their somewhat slavish conception evidently assume, it is not necessary to bring into the field the doubt as to the existence of cocks in Jerusalem, or the fact that the trumpets of the Romans on the tower Antonia or of the priests in the temple would necessarily render this faint morning signal inaudible. It is enough that just as Jesus' prediction could have no reference to the actual crowing of the cock, which was beyond his knowing or reckoning or regulating, so also the literal, more or less energetic morning call of a feathered watcher of the hours was by no means necessary in order to bring an Apostle, in whom there was a conflict between good and evil, to himself. Without the cock-crowing, without the triple character of the apostacy, without the very remarkable fulfilment of the Lord's words, and without the Lord's glance, Peter, in the midst of his hurried and terribly intensifying sinning, could have been brought to himself by a recollection of Jesus' general utterance of distrust. At once ashamed and afraid, doubly humbled and truly broken down in

¹ Luke xxii. 60 sq., here the most highly coloured report. How Jesus could throw this glance at Peter has been the subject of much thought among expositors. It has been supposed to have occurred at the moment of the departure from Annas to Caiaphas (Paulus, Olsh., Schleier., Neander, Bleek). It has not been noticed, either that this incident is possible only in Luke, where Jesus is unhistorically represented as standing in the court throughout the night, or that it is a mere embellishment.

spirit, he now stole out from the portal away from the unhappy place which was more disastrous to him than to his Lord; and he wept, as the Gospels say, bitterly, according to Mark, covering his face with his hands.¹ Thus the last of the disciples left the Lord, who now had to stand alone. But the forsaking was here a finding again, the completion of the humiliation was a part of the history of the glorification. In the tears of Peter, He who until then had been called only "the man" lived again as a conqueror. If the manly Peter wept and did not hide his apostacy and his tears from his companions—as the very preservation of this incident proves—what a power for holiness and love in this soul Jesus must have been even on the day of his abasement! And though it might be a slow process from repentance to conversion, from shame to courage—for Peter did not return to the palace to make a confession and to die with his Master, did not even "afar off" tread his Teacher's path to the cross—there nevertheless lay indestructibly in this soul the good seed of the Son of Man, ready after the storm to hail on the first Sunday the resurrection which was identical with the continuance of Jesus in the Church, in humanity.

¹ Porch, Matt. xxvi. 71, 75. Forecourt, Mark xiv. 68 (without mention of the going out). Luke xxii. 62 implies the going out of the court. The fourth Gospel spares the sufficiently humiliated Apostle his tears, xviii. 27. Instead of *πικρῶς ἔκλαυσεν* (Matt., Luke), Mark xiv. 72 has *ἐπιβαλὼν ἑκλαιεν*. On the different explanations, see particularly Bleek, II. p. 440. The translation of the Vulg. and ancients, *cœpit flere*, is in any case incorrect; that of Casaubon, Wetst., De Wette, and others, down to Grimm and Volkmar, is verbally faultless; after he had remarked it (M. Anton. 10, 30: *ποῦτῳ ἐπιβάλλων*—hoc respiciens). For the sake of clearness a *τοῦτῳ* might be desired, but the idea already lies in *ἀνεμνήσθη*; with the material weeping a material act best harmonizes, especially in Mark; finally, *ἐπιβάλλειν χεῖρας* is a very usual expression, though with different significations. Matt. xxvi. 50; Mark xiv. 46; Luke ix. 62; Acts iv. 3, xii. 1. Similarly Theophyl., and many down to Fritzsche: *veste capiti injecta*.

Third Hour.—MORNING SITTING OF THE SANHEDRIM.

Several hours after this night scene, at the first dawn of day, about 6 a.m., the full Sanhedrim, which had been summoned during the night, held its sitting, as we learn from the three Gospels.¹ What legitimacy might be lacking in the proceedings of the nocturnal sitting of the Sanhedrim, was to be completely made up by the morning sitting, without prejudice to the authority and the—in the main point—decisive action of the former. In many ways the day sitting was necessarily the complement of the nocturnal court. According to the rule, the sittings of the Sanhedrim were held by day, in the morning, particularly in cases of capital crime; more exactly between the morning and the evening sacrifice, the former of which was slaughtered at the first blush of dawn.² Further, especially in cases of important questions, they were to be held in the customary place, not at the high-priest's house, and with as nearly the full number of members as possible.³ For penal trials there was a special rule which, as it harmonized with the mild maxims of the earlier Scribes, must certainly have been derived from ancient times, although it first appears written in the Talmud. The rule was,

¹ Matt. xxvii. 1; Mark xv. 1 (the whole Sanhedrim and that *πρωι*, Hebr. *boker*). Luke xxii. 66: *ὥς ἐγέν. ἡμέρα*. By the nature of the thing, and by the law, as well as by Luke, we are required to think of the actual break of day, not of the fourth watch of the night, from 3 to 6 a.m., Mark xiii. 35. The third hour of the day is 9 a.m. At Easter the sun rose about 6 a.m., Tholuck, p. 309. Bleek (*Beitr.* p. 145) thinks that the priests among the Sanhedrists, who were engaged in the temple, could not have been present. Ewald (p. 567), in order to be in harmony with John, is inclined to think of an hour somewhat long before sunrise. John places the delivery up to Pilate at this time, xviii. 28.

² Comp. *Synops. Soh.* p. 56, n. 2: sessiones iudicii sunt instituendæ mane, non autem postquam homo edit et bibit. Schöttgen, p. 400. Maimon. *Sanh.* c. 3: Syn. magnum sedet a sacrificio jugi matutino (*πρωι*, Jos. *Ant.* 14, 4, 3) ad sacrif. jüge pomeridianum. Lightfoot, p. 462; Friedl. p. 24. The hours of prayer are also connected with these times, *Tanch.* f. 9, 4: tempore precum matutinarum sol est in ortu, tempore meridianarum in medio, tempore vespertinarum in occasu. Schöttgen, p. 419.

³ Above, p. 42, and Lightfoot, p. 462. Very uncertain, Wies. *Beitr.* p. 209.

that though the sentence of acquittal might be spoken on the day on which the trial began, the sentence of condemnation must be postponed until the following day.¹ For all these reasons, therefore, the high-priest adjourned the final decision until the morning; and it is to be noticed that in the night he had prudently refrained from both a formal vote and the formal sentence, "Thou, Jesus, art guilty," as well as finally from the motion to refer the crime to the Romans.² There nevertheless was no lack of illegality. The most striking instance of this was the fact, that though they wished to bring about an extension of the procedure over two days, they had in fact only two sittings, and not two separate days.³ But contempt of the legal ordinances was much more seriously shown by the absence of any investigation into the circumstances of the case at the second sitting, although both law and tradition demanded such an investigation.⁴ Whether the Sabbath and festival commands were trifled with by a judgment and even an execution upon a feast day, will be inquired into when we come to treat of the death of Jesus and to calculate the day upon which he died.

As we find a full Sanhedrim assembled in the morning against Jesus, we should here first of all attempt to discover whether in those times there existed such a Jewish supreme authority as the Gospels confidently speak of. The Great Sanhedrim, so called as the tribunal of the Seventy in distinction from the smaller town Sanhedrims consisting of twenty-three judges, and

¹ *Sanh.* c. 4: de rebus pecuniariis judicant interdum et determinare possunt nocte. De capitalibus judicant interdum et finiunt interdum. Judicia de pecun. absolunt eodem die, sive sint mulctativa sive absolutiva. Judicia de capital. finiunt eodem die, si sint ad absolutionem; si vero sint ad damnationem, finiuntur die sequenti. Light-foot, p. 383; Friedl. p. 96. The mildness of the Scribes, above, I. p. 337, also VI. pp. 55, 75. Recent critics are for the most part not at all clear concerning the significance of this morning judgment; thus notably Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 467, but also Weisse, I. p. 456. Most (above, p. 41) regard it as the only Sanhedrim judgment; Grätz, p. 243; Ewald, p. 567. Like Strauss, Steinm., p. 129, thinks only of the formal resolve to deliver Jesus over to Pilate. Correct, Schenkel, p. 296; Weizs. p. 564.

² Comp. Friedl. p. 89.

³ *Ib.* p. 96. The day is to be reckoned from evening to evening.

⁴ Deut. xix. 18: *καὶ ἐξετάσωσιν οἱ κριταὶ ἀκριβῶς*. Comp. above, p. 44.

therefore designated "The Sanhedrim," "The Sanhedrim of Israel," or "of Jerusalem," did not, as the Rabbis teach, take its rise—at least in the form in which it is tangible to us—in the ancient Mosaic times, from which only the number of the Seventy Elders of Moses was borrowed, but in the times that followed the exile, more exactly—as is shown by its Greek name, "The sitting together"—in the time of the Asmonæan princes of the second century before Christ, when the Jewish learning of the Scribes first flourished, and the Greek language was cultivated in Israel after the introduction of Philhellenism (B.C. 107).¹ It was the highest legislative, administrative and judicial authority in religious matters; and since in Israel everything was bound up with religion, particularly the administration of justice in the name of God, the Sanhedrim had control not only over the whole of the regulation of the temple even to the question of the calendar, but it possessed also the exclusive right of decreeing capital punishment; indeed, by a kind of prefiguring of papal claims, it at least theoretically coveted, and sometimes also practically exercised, the power to decide in temporal matters, even to the choice, control and deposition of princes.² As might be supposed, the Asmonæan princes came into conflict with these rivals, as did yet more violently their heirs, the dynasty of Herod, to whose aspiring ambi-

¹ The synedr. magnum, Matt. xxvi. 59; Luke xxii. 66; Mark xiv. 55, xv. 1; John xi. 47. The great and the small (sanhedrin gedolah, kethannah, Buxt. p. 1513), Matt. v. 21, x. 17. Instead of Sanhedrim, also βουλή, Jos. *B. J.* 5, 4, 2; 6, 6, 3 (Mark xv. 43), or οἱ ἐβδόμηκ. τῶν ἐν τέλει δημοτῶν, *B. J.* 4, 5, 4; or, as in the Gospels, οἱ ἀρχ., γραμμ., πρεσβ., comp. 1 Macc. vii. 33. According to the Rabbis, instituted by Moses, comp. Ex. xviii. 25; Numbers xi. 16; *Sanh.* 1, 6. In the Asmonæan times, chiefly the name γερονσία, 1 Macc. xii. 6, &c. (LXX. in Ex. iii. 16 = sikne Israel); comp. πρεσβυτέριον, Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5. The name *Synedrion*, Talm. *Sanhedrin* (already in LXX., Ps. xxvi. 4, &c., in the general sense of *consensus*), Josephus gives first in *Ant.* 14, 9, 4, but as already for a long time in use under Hyrcanus II. Hitzig (*Gesch.* p. 474) derives the expression (instead of the ancient Bet Din) from the Sadducean tendency which characterized the Asmonæan epoch; I think of the Phil-hellenism after B.C. 107 (above, I. p. 277; comp. the coins); the two things, however, are related. On Roman assessors of the tribunal (συνεδριοι), Eus. 6, 41.

² Comp. Friedl. pp. 15, 20, 25. Exclusive right of capital punishment, Jos. *Ant.* 14, 9, 3; *Sanh.* c. 10. The velleities of the Pharisees, e.g. under Hyrcanus I., Jos. *Ant.* 13, 10, 5 sq.; Hyrcanus II., *Ant.* 14, 9, 3 sqq.; Agrippa II., *Ant.* 19, 7, 4; above, I. p. 332.

tion the tribunal, mentioned by Josephus for the first time in this connection, opposed itself, first boldly, but afterwards timidly.¹ Herod, when he had reached the throne, put most of the Sanhedrists to death, and during the forty years of his reign there is no mention of meetings of the Sanhedrim, but at most only of judicial assemblies arbitrarily called together for occasional purposes.² This fact, together with the total silence of the Jewish historian concerning meetings of the Sanhedrim previous to A.D. 60, has led recent authors to assert that a Sanhedrim did not exist as a legitimate institution under the Herods and the Romans; that at most the leaders of the Schools from time to time, and thus in the days of Jesus, sought more or less arbitrarily and violently, and rather with the claim to public recognition than with recognized authority, to uphold or to restore the obsolete institution.³ The question of a legitimate or of a factiously improvised Sanhedrim is really, so far as it concerns our present subject, a secondary one, if only the Sanhedrim of which our three ancient sources speak is not to be altogether relegated to the province of great historical errors, on the ground of the

¹ King Jannæus protected against the Sanhedrim, *e.g.*, a slave who had committed murder, *Sanh. f.* 19, 1; Friedl. p. 21. Herod, *Jos. Ant.* 14, 9, 4; above, I. pp. 236, 246.

² Arbitrary tribunals under Herod, *e.g.* *Jos. Ant.* 17, 5, 3; 17, 6, 3; foreigners introduced into the tribunal, *ib.* 16, 11, 1. But these assemblies also received the name of *Synedrion*.

³ Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 1857, pp. 278 sqq. Grätz, III. p. 243, at least against the great Sanhedrim; for the presidency of the high-priest instead of the president of the Sanhedrim from the house of Hillel, leads him to think it was only the tribunal of the Twenty-three! Geiger, p. 120, speaks generally of a Jewish tribunal. Hilgenfeld follows Jost, as see in *Passahstreit*, p. 154; *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 338; 1868, p. 65. Weizs., pp. 564 sq., is less uncertain. Hilgenfeld quietly repeats the old position, although I, in Vol. I. pp. 246, 268, had sufficiently established another view. His reason is a very weak one, viz. that the *συριέδρια*, Matt. x. 17, disprove one undivided Sanhedrim. Were there not, then, local *Synedrion*, comp. Matt. v. 21 sqq.? Volkmar knows at least nothing of an ordinary Jewish intermediate tribunal; the trial of Jesus took place only before the Romans (p. 588). These representations are justly opposed by Meyer, *Joh.* p. 521; Hausr. p. 66; Wies. *Beitr.* p. 282, comp. Hitzig, p. 512; and Weizs., p. 565, admits, in opposition to the enticing (?) assumption of a mere *conatus synedrion*, the recognition of the legitimacy of this Sanhedrim by our Gospel sources. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 297, is still silent upon the whole question.

profound silence thereupon of the fourth Gospel.¹ Yet an improvised, arbitrary Sanhedrim would strengthen the impression of a deeply-laid violent intrigue, and a legitimate one would establish and increase the appearance of a legal basis of the trial. It will therefore be well not to pass by the question as one that is altogether indifferent.

The above-mentioned view of recent authors will be seen to be a very exaggerated one. Not only does the New Testament repeatedly speak of *Synedria* in the time of Jesus and the Apostles, but Jesus himself, in a well-established utterance, mentions the *Synedrion* as the highest legally constituted tribunal, and as having the right to pass sentence of death; and Josephus brings forward two *Synedria* during the Roman period, in the decade A.D. 60—70, without in the remotest way representing either them or the *Synedria* afterwards called together during the rebellion at Jerusalem, as novelties. On the contrary, the last *Synedrion* of the Zealots appears as a regularly constituted continuation of the existing judicial system. Moreover, the designation of the national constitution, after the death of Herod and Archelaus, as an aristocracy, points plainly to these supreme legislative and judicial bodies; and, finally, the communications of the Jewish historian concerning the *Synedria* of the last ten years are in a convincing degree incomparably more copious than those of the preceding centuries.² These communications—which are supported by the most definitive assertions of the Talmud—appear to be generally credible; and who would, *e.g.*, suppose Pilate likely to have unquestioningly accepted the trial of Jesus at the hands of an entirely unauthorized assembly? But it is a still weightier consideration that the successors of the Herods, the Romans, never attempted

¹ But see John xi. 47.

² *Synedrion* in the Gospels, above, p. 65, n. 1. In the Acts *very frequently*, iv. 15, v. 21 sqq., vi. 12 sqq., xxii. 30, xxiii. 1—28, xxiv. 20. Jos. *Ant.* 20, 9, 1 (*Synedrion* against James, A.D. 63); 20, 9, 6 (*Synedr.*, Agrippa II. on account of the garments of the Levites, A.D. 65). The *Synedria* of the revolution, Jos. *Vita*, 12; *B. J.* 4, 5, 4. Aristocracy under the presidency of the high-priest, *Ant.* 20, 10.

entirely to remove the national institutions upon which a nation's ordinances depended, if they could be but partially reconciled with the general principles of the Roman government.¹ Even Gabinus, in the time of the Republic, did not destroy the constitution of the Sanhedrim, but simply severed it into five separate tribunals for a time in order to diminish violence. Subsequently, the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, recognized the "national customs" of the Jews everywhere, even to the remotest foreign region, and by way of example granted to the Alexandrian Jews a president and a deliberative assembly with independent judicial authority and administration. Therefore the preservation of the rights of the central Sanhedrim at Jerusalem is not to be doubted until the opposite has been better shown, until the immediate recognition by Pilate of a mere pretentious assembly supported by no strong public agitation has been explained, and until particularly the tribunal to which the functions of the Sanhedrim—as, *e.g.*, the religious judicial function merely—were transferred has been pointed out.² Limitations of the authority of this tribunal, and therewith a diminution of its *prestige*, certainly took place as a matter of course under the Romans. But, apart from the natural exclusion of the interference of the hierarchs in the secular administration—which interference, however, never entirely ceased—the most important change was the withdrawal of the right of capital punishment.

¹ From the Talmud comp. only the notices of the later wanderings of the Sanhedrim, Lightfoot, p. 371, and the cessation of the Sanhedrim at the destruction of the temple, p. 672. Schöttgen, p. 401; Friedl. p. 97. Punishments inflicted by the Sanhedrim, which old men of the later time still remembered, Lightfoot, p. 371. Comp. the alleged stoning of Jesus by the Sanhedrim, *ib.* Βεβαίωσις πατριῶν, Philo, *Leg.* p. 1014 (above, I. p. 263).

² Comp. above, I. pp. 263 sqq. The five Synedria (B.C. 56), Jos. *Ant.* 14, 5, 4. The numerous edicts of the Romans for the Jewish religion abroad, from Julius Cæsar to Claudius, in Josephus. The edict of Cæsar about B.C. 47: the right of Hyrcanus II. over every ζήτησις περὶ τ. Ἰουδαίων ἀγωγῆς, *Ant.* 14, 10, 2. That of Claudius, in A.D. 41: τὰ πάτρια ἔθη ἀνεπικυλῆτως φυλάσσειν, *Ant.* 19, 5, 3; in A.D. 46: βούλεσθαι ἐκάστον κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θρησκεύειν, *Ant.* 20, 1, 2. Antioch also had its Jewish archon (*B. J.* 7, 3, 3), and Sardis a Jewish tribunal (*Ant.* 14, 10, 17). Remember also the ἐπιμέλεια ἱεροῦ which was later bestowed upon the Herods (Herod of Chalcis and Agrippa II.), see above, V. p. 117.

This right was transferred to the procurator from the time of the first Roman governor, that is from A.D. 7, though, according to the very inexact and indeed fanciful recollection of the Talmud, the transference was not made until forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, or A.D. 30. It was a natural consequence of this transference that the Jewish modes of execution should be replaced by Roman.¹ Another diminution was due to the fact that the Romans repeatedly claimed and enforced the right to prevent the sitting of a Sanhedrim in important criminal cases without their consent.² But it should be mentioned as a sign of the persistence of Jews and the tenacity with which they clung to this institution, that this question remained a controverted one to the end; whilst in the early part of the Roman rule—as both our narrative and the first incidents of the apostolic history show—a Roman claim in this direction plainly did not exist at all.³

This Assembly of the Seventy, therefore, met at the call of the high-priest in the official judgment-hall, in the Bet Din, and no longer merely at the house of Caiaphas. The localities cannot at this day be with certainty defined. According to the Talmudists, the original meeting-place of the Sanhedrim was in the

¹ Interference in the administration, by admonitory protests (comp. above, p. 65, n. 2, also I. p. 346, n. 1), *e.g.* by the high-priest Jonathan against the procurator Felix, *Jos. Ant.* 20, 8, 5. Suppression of the Jewish right to inflict capital punishment, see *Ant.* 18, 1, 1 (by the first procurator Coponius): ἡγήσθη. Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἔξουσίᾳ. *B.J.* 2, 8, 1: μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τ. καίς. ἔξουσίαν; comp. Tacitus, *Ann.* 12, 54. Talmud, *Sanh.* f. 24, 2: quadraginta annis ante vastatum templum ablata sunt judicia capitalia ab Israele (*Sanh.* f. 24, 1: judic. pecuniaria diebus Simeonis b. Joehai). Lightfoot, p. 370. But this notice may be disregarded, since the number 40 is very much played upon (*Grätz.* III. p. 493), as when, in *Hier. Jom.* 43, 3 (Lightfoot, p. 369), the temple gate is said to have burst open forty years before the destruction, though it burst open only four years before that event (*B.J.* 6, 5, 3); and further, as when in *Hier. Sanh.* 1, the right of penal jurisdiction, the blood ban (dine naphshot, Bux. p. 1377) is said to have been withdrawn from the nation *before* the forty years (*Grätz.* p. 492; comp. Wies. *Beitr.* p. 209). The Jewish modes of execution: stoning, burning, beheading, strangling (*Friedl.* p. 21); the Roman modes: beheading and crucifying.

² *Jos. Ant.* 20, 9, 1; comp. Acts xxii. 30.

³ The claim of the Romans first shows itself factually in A.D. 59 (Acts xxii. 30) and A.D. 63 (*Ant.* 20, 9, 1); comp. above, I. p. 268, note 1.

inner court, in immediate proximity to God, to the temple and the altar, more exactly in the famous basilica, the square stone hall (Lishkat Hagasit), so called because of its coloured cubes of stone, in the south of the temple.¹ On Sabbath days and festivals, however, such as were just then being celebrated, the sessions were transferred to the Bet Midrash, the temple synagogue, which was "in the wall" (Chel) between the outer court and the court of the women.² But the outer court is suggested also by another item of information. Forty years before the destruction, the Sanhedrim—so says the Babylonian Talmud—removed from the square stone hall, and settled in the booths of the outer court.³ Whensoever and for what reasons, whether voluntarily or involuntarily at the bidding of the Romans, this migration may have taken place, another account remarkably harmonizes with this, speaking of the booths or dwellings of the sons of Annas, that is, of the Sadducean high-priests, and assuming the existence of these dwellings for many years in the outer court, until three years before the burning of the temple, when they were destroyed by fire as a punishment for illegality, for the "hiss of the serpent."⁴ It would therefore be

¹ *Midd. c. 5, 2, 3; Jom. f. 25, 1; Sanh. c. 11, h. 2. Bab. rosh. hash. f. 31, in Lightfoot, pp. 142, 194, 370, 500; comp. above, II. p. 133.* Proximity to God was important, Deut. xvii. 8; hence in temple, Lightfoot, p. 462, *prope div. majestatem*, p. 671, *juxta altare*, p. 672. Half in sancto, half in profano, pp. 194, 671. It must, however, be noted that the βουλή, βουλευτήριο, situated in the west, mentioned by Jos. *B. J.* 5, 4, 2; 6, 6, 3, is not identical with this locality, as Friedl. pp. 8 sq., 24, and Furrer, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 237, assume. See, on the other hand, Lightfoot, p. 371, and Winer, *Synedrium*.

² *Maim. Sanh. c. 3: sabbatis et diebus festis sedit in bet midrash in atrio gentium.* Lightfoot, p. 462. According to *Gem. Sanh. c. 11 (f. 88, 1)*, in the Chel (*Kel. 1: locus muro cinctus inter montem domus et atrium mulierum*, Bux. p. 747). *Comp. Lightfoot, p. 193; Bleek, Beitr. p. 141; Wieseler, Beitr. pp. 209, 279.*

³ *Bab. Avod. Sar. f. 8: quadr. annis (comp. above, p. 69, n. 1) ante vastatum templum migravit synedr. et consedit in tabernis.* Lightfoot, p. 370, *comp. p. 142.* A gloss says: aliquando pro necessitate temporis rediit syn. ad conclave Gazith (never on occasion of capital sentence), p. 672.

⁴ According to the Talmudists, the migration had taken place voluntarily, eo quod viderent homicidas adeo crescere, ut non possent eos judicare. Dixerunt ergo, convenit ut nos e loco in locum migremus, ut sic reatum evadamus, Lightfoot, p. 370. This would apply especially to the years A.D. 50—70. The periodical return also points to a voluntary migration, see previous note. The migration, then, would have been

most natural and most advisable to assume that the meeting-place of the Sanhedrim and the residence of the high-priest were both in the spaces of the outer court, which leaves us free to place the session of the Sanhedrim either in one of the booths or, what is better because the day was a festival one, in the temple synagogue.¹

This proceeding, like that which had taken place in the night, by no means produces the impression that a new and arbitrarily "convened" Sanhedrim (for that was the technical phrase) was entrusted with the final verdict upon Jesus.² Rather do the members appear to be such as had long exercised the function, and as therefore under no special obligation to give effect by their hurriedly summoned votes to the strong party feeling against Jesus. The classes represented at the tribunal are, as elsewhere, enumerated by the Gospels, with all kinds of variations, as high-priests, elders and Scribes. We are to understand as included in the term high-priests former high-priests, as well as members of the dominant high-priestly families, while the term Scribes would include men learned in the law and teachers of a Sadducean or a Pharisaic colour, and the term elders—who indeed gave to the whole assembly the name of the Presbytery—

resorted to in order to avoid profaning the holy place by inaction against wickedness. It is usually assumed that the Romans, when they took away the right of inflicting punishment, removed the Sanhedrim to a less important place. Lightfoot sides with the Talmudists.—On the Chanujot (tabernæ) bene Chanan, *Hier. Peah*, 1, 6; *Siph. Deut.* § 105, Lightfoot, p. 409; Derenb. pp. 467 sqq.; Wies. *Beitr.* p. 211. Derenb. erroneously looks for these mansiones on the Mount of Olives. Volkmar, pp. 551, 582 sq., adopts the same opinion, erroneously adding on his own authority that since Annas's ascendancy the square stone hall had been forsaken. The monks' legend places the country-house of Caiaphas on the "Hill of Evil Counsel," to the south-west of Jerusalem. See Robinson.

¹ There (and in the upper city, *Jos. B. J.* 2, 17, 6) are also the οἶκοι ἐν πόρει, *B. J.* 6, 5, 2. Furrer, p. 237, erroneously seeks the house of the high-priest in the south-western upper city, after *B. J.* 2, 17, 6, where mention is made of the house of the former high-priest Ananias, the destruction of which by the Zealots, four years before the catastrophe, has certainly some similarity to that of the house of Annas three years previously (above, p. 43). Dwellings of the high-priests in the temple, already in *Neh.* xiii. 4, 7; comp. Wies. pp. 209 sqq. Also Gospel of Nicodemus, 5, represents the proceeding as taking place in the (temple) synagogue.

² καθίσαι ἀνέλεον, *Jos. Ant.* 20, 9, 1 sqq.; *B. J.* 4, 5, 4.

would signify lay officials and dignitaries, and in general laymen who occupied a prominent social position.¹ The Jewish accounts also exhibit these classes of notables, whose age and wisdom they frequently laud.² The two chief parties, the Sadducees and Pharisees, alternately obtained the lead. At the time in question, it would appear, from the prevailing tenure of the office of high-priest by Sadducees, and from the strong representation of Sadduceism among the more aristocratic laity, that Pharisaism was in the minority; and the attitude of the tribunal towards Jesus gives further support to this supposition. But if, as might be inferred from the facts of the earliest apostolic times, the parties were nearly in equilibrium, the majority would easily have been gained by the vigorous action of the bold Sadducean initiative.³

From the house of Caiaphas, Jesus was conducted, with a sufficient escort of the temple-guard and of the servants of the tribunal, before the court of the notables of Israel. Though the way was short, and though the sense of security with reference to the powerless prisoner had become very strong, there must

¹ Matt. xxvii. 1, all the high-priests and the elders of the people; Luke xxii. 66, the presbytery, more exactly high-priests and Scribes; Mark xv. 1, high-priests, elders, Scribes. The whole under the name of the presbytery, Luke *l.c.* and Acts xxii. 5. On the high-priests in the plural, comp. Acts iv. 6; Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 6; 2, 14, 8; 2, 15, 2; 4, 3, 8, &c. There were about half-a-dozen families to which the office of high-priest was confined during the Roman times. Comp. Wich. pp. 31 sqq.; Grätz, III. p. 321; Hausrath, p. 66. In many cases the temple treasurer (*Ant.* 20, 8, 11) and the temple captain, who belonged to the leading families, were classed with them. The heads of the priestly classes (Beza to De Wette) are not to be thought of. On the other hand, the numerous deposed high-priests, comp. Ananias, *Ant.* 20, 9, 2; Jonathan, *Ant.* 20, 8, 5. On the lay presbyters, see above, V. p. 283, n. 1.

² *Maim. Sanh.* c. 2: præceptum est, ut in syn. magno sint sacerdotes et Levitæ (comp. Jos. *Ant.* 20, 9, 6); si vero tales non inveniantur constetque syn. ex Israelitis aliis solis, licitum est. According to *Maim. in Hilch. Sanh.* 2—5, the high-priest was chosen to sit in the Sanhedrim only si sapientia ejus dignitati respondeat, which seems to rest upon a confusion of membership and presidentship. Quite contrary to Jos. *Con. Ap.* 2, 23. Condition of admission, renown of the Sanhedrim, in Friedl. pp. 14 sq.

³ Acts v. 17, 34, certainly shows the two parties in equilibrium, a short time after this: in fact, the judicious utterance of a Pharisee prevailed. It is no longer possible to ascertain for certain the relations of the parties. Schleierm., p. 427, thought the Sanhedrim composed chiefly of Sadducees.

still have remained a certain anxiety concerning the people who from early morning would fill the entrances to the temple.¹ Yet we hear nothing of the whispering or the murmuring of the populace, and the procession was quickly "in the wall." But we can surmise that the people were overtaken by surprise, and that Jesus's capture, his powerlessness, the impression of criminality, circumstances which were calculated strongly to influence the popular mind, would tend to discourage, to paralyze and to break down the faith of even those whose sympathy was readiest to respond to a call for sudden resistance. Nay, when the intimate disciples of Jesus had fled, were those who stood further away from him bound to become his body-guard? Even in the hall of the tribunal itself, before the semi-circle of the reclining judges, whose picture has been sketched above, Jesus had nothing more to do than listen to his condemnation. We are almost inclined to be angry with the Evangelists for hurrying so rapidly towards the close, and compressing the final decisive proceedings of the tribunal into a few words; for of course it is not to be supposed that the day assembly was merely a repetition of the night assembly, as Luke—who did not know of the latter—would make it appear to have been.² The brevity of the sources eloquently reveals a fact rather than conceals one. It is evident that there was no repetition of a long procedure, but only a conclusion of the procedure. The question of innocence was not raised, no witnesses were heard, plainly the confession of Jesus was not afresh required of him. The high-priest simply reported the already existing confession, the blasphemy—the *Gidduph*—and the verdict of the nocturnal session, the ratification of which he left to the consideration of those then assembled. There was no opposition, but a unanimous condemnation by vote or by

¹ According to the above (p. 71, n. 1), it is assumed that the house of the high-priest and the place where the Sanhedrim met were near together. If reliance could be placed upon the reading of Alex., Reg., St. Gall., al., in Luke xxii. 66 (*ἀνιγαγον*), the house of Caiaphas was lower down in the city; but Sin., Vat., Beza, have *ἀπὸ γαγον* (It., Ver. : *deduxerunt*); It., Vulg. : *duxerunt* or *adduxerunt*.

² Luke xxii. 66.

acclamation, and then the announcement of the verdict "Guilty" to the guilty one.¹ It is a pure supposition that members of the council who were secret friends of Jesus—whose existence, moreover, cannot be established—either raised an opposition in one of the sessions, or abstained from voting, or were not present.² We might rather ask, not the secret friends of Jesus, but the Pharisees, how they, the defenders of the law and of mildness against the brutality of the Sadducees, the extollers of the bloodless years and decades of the Sanhedrim, the weak protectors of the life of criminals, of robbers, of murderers, of Sicarii, could to a man have been silent in the face of such a judicial proceeding?³ But for the sake of the righteous end even they could here, as on other occasions, silently permit the wrong which at other times they condemned; and in their hatred to Jesus, whose ungodly confession only consummated his notorious contempt of and animosity against the Mosaic ordinances and their representatives, they thankfully hailed this temporary welcome coalition with the Sadducees as the promptest way of passing from

¹ Thou, Reuben, art guilty! Thou, Simon, art acquitted, art not guilty! *Sanh.* in Friedl. p. 89. Votes collected (comp. *Jos. B. J.* 4, 5, 4) by writers, *ib.* The expression in Luke xxiii. 51, *οὐ συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ*, means literally *calculus suum non cum reliquis in urnam demisit*, and then generally *non suffragatus est*. Langen, p. 246, believes in the repetition of the confession of Jesus. *Blasphemy gidduph*, blasphemers *gidduphi*, Bux. p. 392.

² Based upon Luke xxiii. 51; see previous note. The passage in itself can be held to refer to absence or to dissent in voting. But no other Gospel contains anything of this kind concerning Joseph, not even Mark xv. 43, nor John; for when Joseph and Nicodemus are mentioned their anxiety is described, xix. 38 sq. According to the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, 5, Nicodemus pleaded dissuasively before the elders, priests, Levites and people, in the words given in John iii. 2, and in the words of Gamaliel in Acts v. 38 sq.; Sepp, VI. p. 185. According to Renan, 15th ed. p. 410, Jesus' friends were absent or did not vote.

³ *Jos. Ant.* 13, 10, 6: *πρὸς τ. κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσι*. Comp. the examples, *Ant.* 14, 9, 3 sq.; 16, 1, 1. But see, in particular, *Makkot*, c. 1, h. 17: *Synedrium*, a quo vel unus morte mulctatur intra septennium, vocatur destructorium. R. Lazar ben Azaria dixit: a quo vel unus intra 70 annos. R. Tarphon et R. Akiba dixerunt: si nos fuissetus in synedrio, non esset unquam ab eo quisquam interfectus. R. Simeon ben Gamliel dixit: *illi auferunt numerum homicidarum in Israele*. Lightfoot, p. 370. According to *Jos. Ant.* 20, 8, 5, exemption from punishment was probably due still more to the procurator. Almost more interesting still is the maxim, *Chet. f.* 37, 2; *Sot. f.* 8, 2: *diliges proximum sicut te ipsum*, i.e. *decerne ei mortem facilem*; Lightfoot, p. 664.

their long resultless deliberations to sternly accomplished fact. Some conscientious individuals may have hesitated, but their scruples gave way before the animosity of the party, the influence of the Sadducees, the ban of strong hierarchical feeling; and, unlike that Seventy who, called together expressly to inflict a judicial murder upon Zechariah the son of Baruch, acquitted the accused and exposed themselves to the fury of the Zealots, they allowed their votes to flow with the condemning stream.¹ Only one question remained: How, when, should the sentence be executed? The Sadducees, shrewd tacticians, men of the world, quickly solved the question. Pharisaic zealots, in their zeal for God—and why not also out of pity for the criminal, whom “the mild” might be inclined to save from the cruel Roman punishment?—could have found it fitting to have recourse at once to the ancient Mosaic stoning of the blasphemer without the intervention of the Gentile Romans, as happened later in the case of Stephen.² Sadduceeism had respect to facts, to the Roman power and the—to Renan alone unknown—Roman reservation of the ratification and execution of capital punishment.³ It was there-

¹ Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5. 4. Hitzig, p. 577, finds the Sadducees more temperate than the Pharisees during the whole procedure.

² Acts vii. 59. The Talmud, as we know, makes Jesus to have been actually stoned, in maj. glor. legis (Lightfoot, p. 371), and Grätz (III. p. 245) found this probable “out of pity” (comp. above, p. 74, n. 3), nay, customary (comp. Lightfoot, p. 672); when dead he was crucified (more correctly, hanged, Deut. xxi. 22). On the other hand, Tholuck (p. 362) erroneously thought that stoning would have been determined upon by Pilate, if the Sanhedrim had only accused Jesus of being a false prophet and not of claiming to be the Messiah. But stoning is not a Roman punishment at all. Stonings occurred under Herod the Great, Jos. *Ant.* 16, 10, 5 (also among the Arabs, *Ant.* 16, 7, 6).

³ Above, p. 26, n. 3; p. 69, n. 1. Comp. Gust. Geib's *Gesch. d. röm. Crim.-Proz.* (History of the Roman Criminal Process, to the Death of Justinian), 1842, pp. 244, 475 sqq. Renan, 15th ed. p. 411, says that the procurator had not really the right of life and death, but it was possible for him to decide in the case of a provincial. The ancients framed very incorrect hypotheses concerning this handing over of Jesus. According to Chrysostom (*Hom.* 83, upon John), the Jews were anxious to see Jesus on the (Roman) cross (comp. John xviii. 32); according to Augustine (*Tract.* 114, upon John), the Jews could not inflict the punishment because of the Easter festival. Even Mosheim thinks (influenced by John xviii. 31) that the Jews thereby relegated the responsibility to Pilate. Döllinger (*Christ. und Kirche*, 1860, pp. 454 sqq.), has in vain collected passages in support of the right of the Jews to inflict capital punish-

fore resolved, probably on the proposition of the high-priest, to hand Jesus over to the procurator.¹ They were certain that the latter would not refuse to order the execution of a Messiah who was disturbing the peace of the country. They were also certain that, whatever time and mode of execution might be determined upon, the festival and the festival crowds would not release the utterer of fine words whose weakness was now revealed. The destiny of Jesus was thus decided, and on the part of the Jews the judicial murder was completed, which even in the case of a condemnation could have been avoided if only the legal forms had not been trodden under foot.

If we turn from this description of the Jewish trial of Jesus to the different representation by John, we can but be astonished at the very great inexactness and the cursory character of his narrative, as well as at the want of critical acumen on the part of those who would find in this Gospel the most genuine exhibition of what actually took place.² Having, in the most unhistorical way possible, transferred the decisive session of the Sanhedrim under Caiaphas to the day of the resurrection of Lazarus, John gives no other meeting of the Sanhedrim, no tribunal of the Seventy either by night or by day. But instead he gives simply two brief examinations in the night at the houses of the high-priests, first at that of Annas, then at that of Caiaphas; and for the reasonable plea that the fourth Evangelist does not exclude, but merely supplements, the sittings of the Sanhedrim of the

ment; and Langen, in spite of long deliberation and finally a correct decision (p. 254), has not perceived the chief passage besides John xviii. 31, namely, Jos. *B.J.* 2, 8, 1. The Jews were *allowed* only to arrest (above, p. 26, n. 3), to scourge (2 Cor. xi. 24, comp. Jos. *B.J.* 6, 5, 3), and to put such to death as passed beyond the Court of the Gentiles into the enclosure of the temple (Jos. *B.J.* 6, 2, 4; 5, 5, 2; according to Langen, by Titus!). On the other hand, *B.J.* 2, 12, 7 (but comp. *Ant.* 20, 6, 3), was a special case, and the Jews did not dare to put to death even a shamelessly contemptuous Roman temple guard (*B.J.* 2, 12, 1).

¹ Aberle (p. 36) thinks the expression shows a kind of conscious treachery, since they could have regarded the right of the procurator only as a usurpation.

² Yet Steinmeyer (p. 143) quietly serves up for us the tale that John was an eye-and-ear-witness of *everything*, both in the house of Annas and Caiaphas, and in the interior of Pilate's castle. The assertion evinces a more than Johannine courage.

earlier narrative, there remains the less ground because Jesus is sent by the second high-priest to Pilate at break of day, therefore just at the same time at which, according to the earlier report, the great final sitting of the Sanhedrim occurred.¹ The great mistake made as to Annas has long been evident to us; but the hearing before Caiaphas, necessarily decisive of the fate of Jesus, is mentioned in a syllable as unimportant and valueless, and any result of it is not mentioned at all.² The history of the downfall of Jesus can, therefore, be enriched only from the first hearing before Annas, which in itself is not historical. Even here nothing is to be found. The high-priest asks Jesus about his disciples and his teaching; Jesus appeals with dignity to the publicity of his preaching in the synagogue and in the temple, and simply refers the high-priest to those who heard him. Whilst he is thus speaking, one of the servants strikes him in the face, and says: "Answerest thou the high-priest thus?" Jesus responds: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?"³ But can any one believe that the high-priest interrogated him so closely about his disciples, who were conspicuous neither in Gethsemane nor at the guards' fire, and also about his general teaching; or that a servant would have spontaneously maltreated Jesus in the presence of the high-priest and before the close of the trial?⁴ Further, how can Jesus's speaking before the high-priest and against the man who maltreated him, be reconciled with his regal silence before the Sanhedrim, shown by the other sources, and with the gross violence after the verdict? Finally, what has become of the judges, the witnesses, the conjuration of the high-priest, the great confession, the condemnation? It is quite evident that the

¹ John xviii. 28, comp. Matt. xxvii. 1.

² Above, pp. 36 sq. John xviii. 19, 24. The case of Annas might be assisted by the parallels of Ananias, the old high-priest (A. D. 48—60) who was still powerful in A. D. 66, *Jos. Ant.* 20, 9, 2, and of Jonathan, *Ant.* 20, 8, 5.

³ John xviii. 19—23. Alapa, It., Vulg., also xix. 3, comp. above, p. 52, n. 3. Bengel: blow from a rod.

⁴ The evident prototype more correct, Acts xxiii. 2.

Evangelist has no conception of an independent Jewish trial. Out of the fact that the final decision rested with Pilate, he has, erroneously and with an inclination to favour the Gentiles, inferred that the Jews decided nothing, but simply brought an *accusation* before Pilate, who was in truth the only, and therefore now the exclusively emphasized, tribunal. Hence he believed himself justified in only briefly indicating what was preliminary to the accusation, while he narrates at length the accusation itself, the hearing, and the verdict.¹ Our conviction upon this point becomes established when we observe how the individual pieces of this narrative are arbitrarily-arranged fragments borrowed from preceding narrators. The teaching of Jesus was the subject of inquiry to the extent that the high-priest asked him in the presence of the Sanhedrim for information concerning the separate charges made by the accusers, and then concerning his divine Sonship. Of his preaching in public, Jesus had spoken in Gethsemane in the presence of those who arrested him. Jesus was maltreated at the close of the nocturnal session by the servants, more correctly by persons belonging to the Sanhedrim; and the Apostle Paul at a later period, also at a session of the Sanhedrim, verbally defended himself against the servant of the high-priest.² John has not only introduced here foreign matter, but has removed to other places matter that belongs here. For he has transferred—not without finding in his predecessors themselves some small support—the great and solemn confession of Jesus from the Jewish tribunal to the Roman, and at the same time has given it a fundamentally different, namely, a super-Jewish, super-Messianic, meaning.³

¹ Hence, John xviii. 29, *κατηγορία*. It is more probable that the author has thus reported because in his mind the unimportant Jewish tribunal that was disposed of in xi. 47 sqq., erroneously disappeared before the Roman tribunal (as the temple guard before the Roman soldier), than that he intentionally aimed at describing the powerlessness of the Jews. On the other hand, xviii. 31, xix. 6.

² Acts xxiii. 2 sq. This is the Ananias, son of Nebelæus, mentioned above, p. 71, n. 1, p. 77, n. 2.

³ The previous narrators speak of a brief confession, "Yes," before Pilate. They also speak of the accusations of the high-priest. Finally, Luke had already given the trial before Pilate more copiously than that before the Jews.

Fourth Hour.—BEFORE PONTIUS PILATE.

A longer procession moved, about 7 a.m., from the temple spaces towards the buildings devoted to the purposes of the government.¹ First went Jesus, now bound, and probably both hand and foot, with a retinue of guards; then followed, not merely a number of deputies from the Jewish tribunal, but—a weighty demonstration which was on other occasions dispensed with—the high-priest and the whole Sanhedrim.² The governor's residence lay, not where legend has placed it to the north of the temple near the fortress Antonia, but in the upper city on the south-west of the temple hill.³ A gate and a bridge-like viaduct

¹ The time is indicated by *πρωίας*, Matt. xxvii. 1; above, p. 63. Heedlessly yet purposely, John, xviii. 28, gives immediately for the audience with Pilate *πρωί* (followed by Tholuck, Wies., Wich., Ewald), and Tholuck, p. 309, Ewald, p. 573, add that it was the Roman custom for the procurator to be at his post at sunrise, about 6 a.m., or earlier. On the other hand, Friedl. p. 105, mentions 9 a.m. as the usual time. In truth there was only the general principle: ante exortum aut post occasum solis (senatus-consultum factum) ratum non fuit. Gell. 14, 7. Magistratus p. exortum solem agunt, Macr. *Sat.* 1, 3. Geib, pp. 113 sq., 265, 540. But it was customary to begin very early, Sen. *Ira.* 2, 7: hæc tot millia ad forum *prima luce* properantia quam turpes lites etc. habent. At a later time only the forenoon, Geib, *l.c.*; and after 2—3 p.m. no case was commenced, Wies. *Beitr.* p. 281. Prætorium (Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28, 33, xix. 9) might possibly mean the fortress and barracks Antonia (Matt. xxvii. 27; comp. Phil. i. 13, but also iv. 22); Mark and John, however, plainly point to the residence of the procurator; and in addition comp. Acts xiii. 35: prætorium Herodis, in Cæsarea.

² Fetters, Matt. xxvii. 2; Mark xv. 1. Luke xxiii. 1 is silent; John xviii. 12 has the binding already in Gethsemane. Horace, *Ep.* 1, 16, 76: in mancis et compedibus. Accompanied by the whole Sanhedrim, Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 12, 20; comp. also Mark. In Luke xxiii. 1 expressly: ἄπαν τ. πλῆθος ἀπτῶν. John, xviii. 28 sqq., does not exclude a numerous accompaniment. Differently Acts xxiv. 1. Therefore it is a mistake to speak of deputies (Neander, Friedl., Renan, and others).

³ See particularly Jos. *B. J.* 1, 21, 1; 5, 4, 4; *Ant.* 15, 9, 3; 15, 11, 5; κατὰ τ. ἄνω πόλιν, *B. J.* 1, 21, 1; *Ant.* 15, 9, 3. Comp. notes on pp. 80 sq. Tradition, dating from the Itinerary of Antoninus (Casp. p. 193), now shows the house of Pilate on the north-west of the harem and of the old temple site, partly because there Antonia is supposed to have been, and partly because the residence of the Turkish pasha (es-Serai, præfecture) was there. According to Raumer, *Palästina*, 4th ed. 1860, p. 298, the residence of the pasha (according to Renan, his harem) is still there; but according to Rosen, *Zeitschr. der deutschmorg.* G. 14, 606, it has been for more than twenty-one years [1872] a barrack. Comp. Arn. *R. E.* XVIII. p. 608. Langen, p. 264. The prætorium was still looked for near Antonia by Ewald,

across the ravine that lay between led directly from the west porch of the temple across the Xystus, a public place surrounded by columns, to the old royal palace of the Asmonæans, then still further westward and higher to the new palace of king Herod.¹ Thus it often happened that the Roman governor inherited the splendid edifices of the local kings. The proprætor of Sicily occupied the castle of king Hiero, the procurator of Judæa the forsaken palaces of Herod, both in Jerusalem and in Cæsarea by the sea.² Down to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the building was still frequently called the king's castle, or by the Roman name for the governor's house, the prætorium, or by the mixed name of the prætorium of Herod. It is incorrect to translate prætorium, as Luther does, by the term "court of justice," although it often served as such.³ As late as the beginning of the Jewish war, and therefore a generation after the time we are now treating of, this palace, evidently well preserved by the Romans, exhibited a magnificence which Josephus repeatedly speaks of as indescribable and incomparable.⁴ Situated on the north-west of the upper city, contiguous to the first city wall with its imposing white towers Marianne, Hippicus, Phasael, it was itself in part

Wies., Kraft, Casp., Langen (the last looked there at least for the residence of Pilate at that time); in the castle of Herod, Hug, Friedl., and now also Ewald, Wieseler. On the other hand, Aberle, p. 39, still finds it doubtful whether Pilate possessed an official residence in Jerusalem; perhaps he lodged (as a guest) in the palace of the Herods. Comp. below, p. 103, n. 6.

¹ Comp. especially Jos. *Ant.* 15, 11, 5 (bridge), *B.J.* 2, 16, 3 (bridge, Asmonæan palace and Xystus). Proximity to the temple, *B.J.* 2, 15, 5; 5, 4, 4. Also Herzog, XVIII. p. 648. Furrer, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 237.

² Cicero in *Verr.* II. 5, 12, 30: ex illa domo prætoria, quæ regis Hieronis fuit. *B.J.* 2, 14, 8; Φλώρος ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἀντίζεταί; 2, 15, 5: τὸ πρὸς τ. βασιλείοις στρατόπιδον. Also τὸ βασιλ., *Ant.* 15, 9, 3; αἰλή βασιλείως, *B.J.* 5, 4, 4. Quite distinct from the palace of the Asmonæans in which Agrippa II. and Bernice dwelt, *B.J.* 2, 16, 3. Philo, *De Leg.* p. 1034, most distinctly identifies the palace of Herod with that of Pilate: ἐν τοῖς Ἡρώδου βασιλείοις, and in the same context ἐν οἰκίᾳ τῶν ἐπιτρόπων. This quite agrees with the similar conversion of the palace of Herod in Cæsarea ad mare into a residence for the governor: πραιτώριον Ἡρώδου, Acts xxiii. 35.

³ Acts xxiii. 35, xxv. 23. Tholuck, p. 362.

⁴ Particularly Jos. *Ant.* 15, 9, 3; *B.J.* 5, 4, 4.

a tyrant's stronghold and in part a fairy pleasure-house.¹ A wall thirty cubits high, crowned with towers at regular distances, ran round the whole, which was so large that a small army could be stationed therein.² The building itself, with a magnificent prospect over the whole of Jerusalem, spread out into two colossal marble wings, whose regal splendour, far surpassing even the marvellous work of the temple, is again and again mentioned with emphasis by the Jewish historian as exhibiting worthy monuments of the Roman imperial friends after whom the one wing was called the *Cæsareum* and the other *Ægrippeum*.³ Among the numerous chambers, which were remarkable for the variety of their decorations and for their rich gold and silver utensils, the most conspicuous were the great room for men and the great dining-hall, furnished with one hundred table-couches, and therefore capable of accommodating three hundred distinguished guests. The floors and walls were covered with the rarest and the most diverse stones, the ceilings showed gigantic beams and splendid decorations. Outside, the buildings were surrounded by intricate colonnades of the most diversified architecture. Beyond these again were magnificent green parks with broad walks, deep canals and cisterns which poured their water out of brazen mouths, whilst numbers of tame doves among the turrets scattered about the basins gave animation to and com-

¹ The contiguity, *B.J.* 5, 4, 4. Whilst Robinson, in his *Biblical Researches*, looked for the palace near the western tower, Hippicus, Wies., *Beitr.* pp. 249 sq., was led by Josephus to think it should be located rather by the most eastern tower, Mariamne. Josephus does not mention either, and merely refers to the long stretch of the palace and its parks southward from the three towers. Here there is not wanting quite a series of contradictory descriptions. Hug, *Einl.* I. p. 15: north-west of Antonia and temple; Ewald, p. 576: tolerably far eastward, in the city. Comp., on the other hand, Van de Velde, Furrer and his map, *Bib.-Lcx.* III. p. 246.

² Jos. *B.J.* 2, 15, 5. Strategical importance as second fortification, after Antonia, *B.J.* 5, 5, 8; 2, 17, 7. Furrer, *l.c.* p. 236.

³ Jos. *B.J.* 1, 21, 1; *Ant.* 15, 9, 3; *B.J.* 5, 4, 4. Furrer, *l.c.* p. 236, incorrectly: only halls. The prospect from the palace of the Asmonæans was celebrated, *Ant.* 20, 8, 11. It could not have been less fine from the higher palace of Herod. The indescribable splendour, *B.J.* 5, 4, 4. In comparison with the temple, *B.J.* 1, 21, 1.

pleted the picture.¹ A proud residence for a Roman knight, and yet inhabited only for a day or a week at a time, for example during the festivals, and particularly at Easter with its dreaded inspirations of the Jewish longing for freedom, which the festival, the air of spring, and the great rendezvous of the nation, charmed into activity.² To temper this excitement, the procurator, often accompanied by the legate of Syria, appeared on the spot for a week or two, though at other times he preferred residing at Cæsarea by the sea, where intercourse with all parts, particularly with the West, was easier, and where life was less cramped by "the excess" of Jewish piety.³

"The rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, those who wear soft raiment are in kings' palaces!" thus had Jesus formerly given expression to the repugnance of Galilean simplicity, free-

¹ Particularly, Jos. *B.J.* 5, 4, 4. Comp. the magnificent gardens of Hyrcanus, *Ant.* 12, 4, 11.

² Pilate, according to precedent (above, II. p. 223) must be regarded as knight. Uncertain and contrary to the spirit of the time (Suet. *Tib.* 30) is Thilo's assertion (*Cod. apocr. N. T.* p. 522) that Pilate, a man of low condition, won his position by marriage with Claudia Procula (see below), a freed-woman of the gens Claudia and of Tiberius. Upon the name I remark further: Pontius (in Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 44, thence introduced into Matt. xxvii, 2, where Pontius is wanting in Sin., Vat., Beza; against Volkmar, p. 596) shows connection with the gens Pontia, which probably sprang from Samnium (Pontius the leader of the Samnites against the Romans). Pilate (ancient codices Πιλάτος) is cognomen, as elsewhere the cognomen occurs, P. Aquila, Cominius, Latinus, Mgrinus, Telesinus. Pilate elsewhere mentioned only by Tacitus. It means, furnished with javelin, Virgil, *Æn.* 12, 121 sq.: pilataque plenis agmina se fundunt portis. Ridiculous derivation from pileatus, furnished with the felt hat of freedom, comp. Suet. *Ner.* 57: plebs pileata (after the death of the tyrant) tota urbe discurrit. Quite as untenable is the account, *Chron. Pasch.* 410, that Pilate sprang from the island Pontus near Rome. Perhaps Pontia, west of Naples, is meant (another near Velia), famous through the persecution of Christians under Domitian.

³ We find half-a-dozen such Easter journeys of procurators and legates: (1) Jos. *Ant.* 18, 4, 3 (Vitellius); (2) 18, 5, 3 (Vitellius); (3) *B.J.* 2, 12, 1 (Cumanus); (4) *B.J.* 2, 12, 6 (Quadratus); (5) *Ant.* 20, 9, 3 (Albinus); (6) *B.J.* 2, 14, 3 (Cestius Gallus and the procurator Florus). Comp. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2 (Caponius). Most visitors at Easter, above, I. p. 303. The festivals occasions of sedition: *μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς εὐωχίαις ἀντῶν στάσις ἄπτεται*, *B.J.* 1, 4, 3; 2, 12, 6; *Ant.* 20, 5, 3. Easter tumult, e.g. *Ant.* 17, 9, 3 (Archelaus); 20, 5, 3 (Cumanus); *B.J.* 2, 12, 6 (Quadratus, ἀθορύβως); 2, 14, 3 (Cestius). Even Agrippa I. was glad to avoid *πίους* Jerusalem; Agrippa the Roman admired the *αἰσιότητα* of Jerusalem, Philo, p. 1033. Pilate, Jos. *B.J.* 2, 9, 3, shook his head at the *ἄκροτον δευσιδαιμονίας* of the Jews.

dom and piety, to emperors and temporal dominion; and now he himself, unwilling and fettered, passed through the gate of a king's palace.¹ The man before whom he was arraigned we know as one of the most unjust, violent, cruel and dangerous of scourges, one who was truly what his name signified, the slaying "javelin" of the unhappy nation.² What could Jesus expect from the procurator who hated the people with all his heart, and played with their property and blood as if he were dealing, not with men, but at most with a lower race of contemptible and superstitious helots? Only one thing could be in Jesus's favour, viz. Pilate's hatred of the nation and its higher orders, his sympathy with a man of the opposition who might gratify his spirit of intense antagonism by serving as a welcome and unsurpassable instrument of keeping at bay, vexing and tormenting the Jews. And since he did not share the strong Jewish feeling against Jesus, but in that respect was a calm and sober non-partizan, or indeed was sympathetically disposed towards the accused, the thing hitherto unheard-of could happen, viz. that the harsh, haughty, Gentile Roman was more sensitive to the impression of the innocence or at least the harmlessness of Jesus, than were Jesus's fellow-countrymen and the venerable council of elders. That Jesus did not receive a continuous protection, as the Apostle Paul afterwards did from the wretched procurator Felix, was due partly to Pilate's character and partly to his experience as a governor.³ The hardened and lawless

¹ Matt. xx. 25, xi. 8.

² Above, I. pp. 265 sq., 305 sq., II. pp. 223 sqq. The Samaritans also complained of his ὕβρις, *Ant.* 18, 4, 2. The relative praise of Pilate by Winer, Ewald, Renan (first by Gernar, 1785), is still in part shared by Hitzig, p. 577: not worse than others. Also Aberle, p. 35, and Steinmeyer, pp. 143 sq. (the latter out of regard for John). Can this be said, in spite of Philo and of the scandalous chronicle which Josephus gives only—with any copiousness—concerning Pilate? Schenkel, in his outline of the *L. J.* in *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 297, has to some degree withdrawn from the position (p. 298) that Pilate is not described (by Josephus) as bloodthirsty and cruel. Correctly, Tholuck, p. 370. Pressensé also forms a correct opinion, but makes him the third procurator, whilst he is the sixth (p. 392). Tertullian, *Ap.* 21, makes him the Syrian governor. Comp. also *Anaphora Pil.* in Tisch. p. 413.

³ Acts xxiv. 24 sqq.

petty tyrant was by nature incapable of being strongly impressed and of forming a resolve to abide by the right. It should be added, he had reason to fear that the notables would complain at Rome, and that the masses would make a tumult at Jerusalem. During his nine years of office he had become painfully sensible of the successful obstinacy of the Jews, and in his latter years had had such a lively experience of the reprimands of the emperor Tiberius, that he had at length learnt to dread the fire which had singed him, with the result of making possible the praise of Tacitus, which has a mocking sound to our ears: "Under Tiberius there was quiet!"¹ Thus did he behave in the trial of Jesus. He superficially protected him, half pityingly and half contemptuously, and finally sacrificed him, satisfied that he could at least, in Jesus's death, insult the nation itself in the man whom he protected. Yet we have the impression that even a Pilate would have spared Jesus if the clamour of the Jews had not been so strong, and the fruits of his long misrule had not been so bitter for himself.

The proceedings before Pilate, before whom the trial came as a perfect novelty, took place, according to all probability, in the open air and in front of the palace.² Publicity was a characteristic of Roman trials. Hence we find that the Roman procurators at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, the pro-consul of Achaia at Corinth, the city magistrates in Macedonia and Asia Minor, even the Jewish-Roman king Herod, his sons and grandsons, administered justice before the palace, on the market-place, in the theatre, at the race-course, or even upon the highway.³ The

¹ Above, I. pp. 266, 307. Complaints at Rome, Tac. *Ann.* 2, 42; Jos. *Ant.* 20, 6, 3; 20, 8, 11. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 9: Sub Tiberio quies.

² The opinion that Pilate had been (probably on the occurrence of the arrest) previously informed, even in Schleier. p. 427; rejected by even Bäumlein, on the strength of John xviii. 29. Above, p. 26, n. 2.

³ Comp. Herod (theatre), *Ant.* 17, 6, 3; Philip (highway), 18, 4, 6; Agrippa I. (before the people), Acts xii. 4; Pilate (race-course), *B.J.* 2, 9, 3; Florus (tribunal before the palace at Jerusalem), *B.J.* 2, 14, 8; magistrate at Philippi, Acts xvi. 19 (in the market-place), comp. xvii. 6 sqq., xviii. 12 sqq., xxv. 6. An enclosed place is indicated only in Acts xxv. 23 (opp. xxv. 6). In the time of the emperors these audi-

most apposite example is that of the procurator Florus, who, in A.D. 66, caused his seat of judgment to be set up before the palace of Herod, where he resided, and enthroned thereon received the high-priests, the powerful, all the notables of Jerusalem, who stood round his seat. There he received even Bernice the Jewish queen, who came bare-foot and suppliant.¹ The earlier Gospels suggest this and no other place; for whilst they speak of a leading of Jesus before Pilate, they also speak of a great assembly of people, therefore they must refer to a public procedure before the palace. Matthew, or his editor, has moreover expressly mentioned the *bēma* or tribunal, the judgment-seat of the governor.² But, according to John's account, the procedure consisted mainly of an endless series of dialogues, of which this author was fond, and of a continuous going to and fro of Pilate between Jesus in the palace and the Jews standing outside, with a view of mediating between them, the whole being brought to a close by a brief judicial sitting. But this account must yield to the earlier ones, for not only is such an ambulatory peripatetic business-procedure a thing otherwise unheard-of, but it would have failed to satisfy the claims of justice since it did not confront the parties, and it would have been burdensome and altogether unworthy of the gravity of a Roman governor.³ It is, however, possible that the site of the alleged final place of judgment in John is, according to oral or written tradition, correctly designated by the Aramaic name *Gabbatha*, and the certainly very imperfectly corresponding

toria became more numerous. Tac. *Orat.* 39: quantum virium detraxisse orationi auditoria et tabularia credimus, in quibus jam fere plurimæ cause explicantur. Earlier it was a principle: *ἰδὲ καζεν ἐν τῷ φανερωτάτῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς*, Dion. II. 2, 29. Cic. *De harusp. resp.* 6: maxima frequentia ampliss. ac sapientiss. civium adstante. Comp., on the whole, Geib, *l. c.* pp. 97 sqq., 252 sqq., 508 sqq.

¹ Jos. *B. J.* 2, 14, 8: 2, 15, 1. In the former passage: *ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἀνλίζονται*. τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίᾳ βῆμα πρὸ αὐτῶν θέμενος καθέζεται (comp. Acts xxv. 6).

² Matt. xxvii. 19. Also John xix. 13 (Acts xviii. 12 sqq., xxv. 6 sqq.). The Jews also adopted the word be(i)mal. Bux. p. 295; Schöttgen, p. 235. Elsewhere (*ib.*) mention is made of sedere in sella iudicis.

³ John xviii. 28 sqq., xix. 13. Weisse (I. p. 459) has already pointed to John's frequent use of the dialogue.

Greek *Lithostrōton*.¹ The Aramaic name would signify an elevated place, a "hump;" the Greek, a "stone pavement," that is, a floor of stone cubes, or perhaps of Roman marble mosaic, upon which the portable tribunal was placed.² This site, probably originally devoted to audiences of all kinds, would, according to John himself, be best looked for between the palace and the wall that ringed it, particularly as the description of the palace has sufficiently shown its luxurious floors within and its costly surroundings without; while, on the other hand, the forced placing of the *Lithostrōton* at a greater distance, and even in the open spaces of the temple—whose porches certainly possessed *Lithostrōton*, that is stone flooring—has everything against it.³

¹ Several codices and versions (H., Oxon., Petrop., 9 sœc.; It., Colb.; Vulg. in part) write Gaba(e)tha; but this is not the original; see following note. Fabulous, Sin., Golgotha; It., Brix., Gennesar.

² The word gabbatha (thus most codices, particularly B, A, Sin. corr.) is usually derived from gab, Aramaic gabbeta, ridge, hillock (Winer, Meyer, Grimm, Wies., and others). But from gab comes gabba (Buxt. p. 377). Tholuck thinks of gabah, gabahta; Hengstenberg, better, of Gibeat (Josh. xviii. 28); but whence, in these cases, the bb? Gibeah in LXX. is always Γαβαά; Jos. Ant. 6, 4, 6, Γαβαθή; Eus. Onom. 129, 131, Γαβαθά. Comp. Γαβατσαούλη, σημαίνει ἐν τοῦτο λόφον Σαούλον, B. J. 5, 2, 1. The word is derived neither from gibeat nor gevalh (ridge), but from gib(e)ba or gibba (Targ. Rabb., Bux. p. 377), emph. gibbata, Greek Γαββαθά(ᾱ), like Γαβαθά (Gibeah), Eus. On. 131 sqq., comp. Γαλαὰδ (Gilead), Γάλαλα (Gilgal). The word (from gabbeb, tollo) signifies, like gab gibbus, collis, βουνός. Lithostrōtum is in itself any stone pavement, and thus lith. is spoken of in the temple cloisters, B. J. 6, 1, 8; 6, 3, 2. Particularly is mosaic flooring thus described in Isid. Orig. 15, 8: lithostrata parvulis crustis ac tessellis tinctis in varios colores, vocata pavimenta. Caesar is said to have indulged in the luxury of carrying such with him on his campaigns, Suet. Cæs. 46: in expedit. tessellata et sectilia pavimenta circumtulisse. Kuinöl, Lücke, Tholuck, think of the same; but at any rate we are not to think of a portable lith., but of a fixed one with the usual designation (Winer, Grimm). On the other hand, according to B. J. 2, 14, 8, the tribunal was not fixed. There has been much erroneous speculation about the lith.; in particular, it has been identified with the pavement in the porches and cloisters of the temple (thus Hug, I. p. 15; Wies. Chron. p. 408), comp. Winer, Lith. More correctly, Tholuck, p. 362. Ewald, p. 53: a projection from Herod's castle, adorned with marble stones. And Friedl. p. 105: a space near the palace paved with flagstones.

³ The analogy of the public appearance of Florus in B. J. 2, 14, 8 (see above, p. 85, n. 1), allows us to think rather of a space within the walls of the palace than of one without. If it was without, then the nearest place to be thought of (with Faber, Arch. pp. 318 sq.) would be in the immediately adjacent space Xystus (properly a covered colonnade), B. J. 2, 16, 3; also 5, 4, 2; 6, 3, 2; 6, 6, 2; but it is impossible to select, with Casaub., Lightfoot, Selden, and others, the lisakat hagasit, or, with Iken, the cloisters of the Gentiles (har habait).

Thus, on the quadrangular or crescent-shaped wooden or stone tribunal which was erected upon an elevated spot and commanded the court, Pilate, according to custom on these most important days of administering justice, sat upon his official seat, perhaps the ancient golden royal chair. Beside him, upon benches, were the council or the assessors of the court, sub-officials, friends, Roman citizens, whose presence could not be dispensed with, and who were not wanting to the procurators of Judea, although our reports do not mention them. The steps leading to the tribunal were occupied by the Sanhedrists who delivered up their victim.¹ There was sitting room on the tribunal also for the accusers and the accused; but for the subjects in Judæa this custom did not prevail, and Jesus in particular stood.² An interpreter was not called for: the Sanhedrists spoke Greek, the language used in the presence of the Roman governors in the East, and Jesus had necessarily become acquainted with Greek in Galilee.³ Lower down, prisoners would be lying in

¹ *βῆμα ὑψηλόν*, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 1, 1; Eus. *De Martyr. Pal.* 7. Golden throne of Archelaus, *Ant.* 17, 8, 4. For further details on the tribunal, see Geib, p. 262, and Pauly. The Synoptics favour the supposition that the judicial session had already commenced; but John xviii. 28 sq. does not. A *συνβούλιον* (consilium, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 21, 54; 5, 6, 12; 5, 44, 114; consiliarii, Suet. *Tib.* 33; assessores = *πάρεδροι, σύνεδροι*, Eus. 6, 41, Suet. *Galb.* 14, Seneca, *Tranq.* 3) is found associated with the procurator Festus at Cæsarea, Acts xxv. 12; Mark Agrippa, Jos. *Ant.* 16, 2, 3, comp. Tac. *Ann.* 12, 54. On the other hand, there is no mention of such in Jos. *B. J.* 2, 14, 8, &c. On their names, constitution, and powers, see Geib, pp. 244—248, 443 sqq. The delivering up, Matt. xxvii. 2 and parallel passages.

² Cic. *P. Rosc. Am.* 6: *accusatorum subsellia*. Cic. *Ad. Div.* 8, 8: *s. rei*. Matt. xxvii. 11, and above, p. 85, n. 1.

³ Interpreters (among the Romans, as early as the Punic wars, Livy, 27, 43; attendants upon the governors, Cic. *Verr.* 3, 37, *Ad. Div.* 13, 54) mentioned in *B. J.* 6, 6, 2 (Titus); comp. Josephus commissioned by Titus, *ἑβραϊζων, πατριῶν γλώσση λαδων*, *B. J.* 6, 2, 1; 5, 9, 2. He alone understands and interprets the Jewish deserters, *Con. Ap.* 1, 9. For the rest, we find no mention of interpreters in the New Testament and Josephus, and it is probable that the proceedings were conducted in Greek (Cic. *Verr.* 4, 66; Val. Max. 7, 7, 6; Tac. *Hist.* 2, 8; Seneca, *Ep.* 12; Tert. *Scap.* 5; and see in particular Hug, *Eiul.* II. pp. 27 sqq.), as Greek was also used by the Romans in legal remissions; comp. *Ant.* 14, 12, 3; also the Greek and Roman inscriptions in the cloisters at Jerusalem, *B. J.* 5, 5, 2; 6, 2, 4. Even the Jewish deed of divorce was either in Hebrew or Greek, *Gitt.* c. 9. In spite of the Jews' want of proficiency in Greek (*Ant.* 20, 11, 2), they understood this language in case of necessity, so that, as in the case of Paul, Acts xxii. 2, a speech might be composed in Greek instead of

fetters, and the people would be assembled. A dense troop of soldiers of the garrison kept guard.¹

The Roman trial consisted much more of accusation than of inquisition.² The Sanhedrists presented their accusation without the intervention of a special orator, such as at a later period was employed against the Apostle Paul.³ Doubtless the high-priest Caiaphas himself was the speaker, and began with the principal accusation that Jesus had made himself king of Israel and had published himself as such.⁴ The confession of divine sonship was very prudently allowed to fall into the background, because the theological question was less interesting to the Romans, and paganism could more readily admit sons of God than could Judaism. Out of the religious crime was made a political one. Because, to the Jews, the Son of God meant essentially the same as the Messiah who was to be the future ruler of the nation, and Jesus himself had, on the strength of the passage in the Book of Daniel, claimed the right to rule, his confession was subtly and with partial truth formulated into a pretension to the kingdom.⁵ It was inevitable that this accusation should influence the Romans very differently from that legal question for which

Hebrew. Comp. *Acta Pil.* 1. Galilee was less proficient in Greek than Jerusalem, because in the latter place that language had been brought more into vogue by the Asmonæans, the Herods, and the governors. On the other hand, *B. J.* 3, 3, 2: ἔθνεσιν ἀλλοφύλοις κυκλωμένη; Strabo, 16, 2, 34: οἰκουμ. ἐπὶ φύλων μικτῶν. In addition, a number of πόλεις ἐλληνίδες, *Ant.* 17, 11, 4, at the head of them the chief towns Tiberias and Sepphoris.

¹ Matt. xxvii. 27, and the speaking analogy, *B. J.* 2, 14, 8 sq. Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 7: πρὸς τ. στρατιωτικοῦ δορυφούμενος στίφους. Also Eus. 6, 41. Prisoners, *Mart. Pal.* 7. The people, Luke xxiii. 4, comp. Livy, 26, 15 (concio).

² Geib, pp. 98 sqq., 254 sqq., 515 sqq. Cic. *Pro. Rosc. Am.* 20: nocens nisi accusatus fuerit, condemnari non potest.

³ Acts xxiv. 1; comp. *Ant.* 16, 2, 3, and above, I. p. 255.

⁴ The high-priest, comp. Matt. xxvii. 12; Mark xv. 3. The accusation implied in Matt. xxvii. 11; Mark xv. 2. The precise formulating of the accusation in Luke xxiii. 2, comp. 3 (approved by most), not trustworthily, especially since, according to Matt., Mark, and even Luke, the more copious accusation does not come until afterwards.

⁵ This change of tactics by the opponents has been already noted by Neander, p. 562. Comp. Acts xvii. 7, similar Jewish-political accusation.

the pro-consul Gallio, at Corinth in A.D. 55, had nothing but a smile, and that the announcement of an act of high treason should so affect the new ruler's notorious and indeed just suspicion of the fidelity of his new subjects, and of the revolutionary longings of the leaders of the people, as to call forth the response of an immediate condemnation.¹ Hence Pilate, to whose watchful mistrust the accusation was especially addressed, did not treat this part of the charge lightly. According to Roman practice, a confession of guilt by the accused was needed; indeed, according to the ancient law, this was sufficient to carry condemnation.² "Art thou the king of the Jews?" therefore asked Pilate, probably after the name of the criminal had been attested.³ "Thou sayest it," responded Jesus, as he had previously replied to the Sanhedrim, though now with only one word, without addition, without excitement, without any of the former solemnity of address to his countrymen among whom he had, with the suddenness and force of a thunderstorm, thrown Daniel the prophet. On the previous occasion, he had naturally addressed his religious confession to the nation; here he stood before an individual who did not understand his religion. Yet it is surprising that he affirmed himself to be the king of Israel as bluntly as on the previous occasion he had confessed himself the Son of God; and that he added no explanation, less to establish the reality of his dignity—since he was no longer in the presence of the Sanhedrim—than to show the absence of antagonism between his dignity and the Roman rule, a circumstance he had not mentioned until the close of his ministry in the controversy about the Roman

¹ Gallio, Acts xviii. 14.

² General rule of law: magistratus de confesso sumat supplicium. Quint. *Decl.* 314. Seneca, *Controv. Exc.* 8, 1. Sallust, *Cat.* 52: de confessis sicuti de manifestis rerum capitalium more majorum supplicium sumundum. Comp. Geib, pp. 137, 273 sqq., 612. Also the Christian trials are instructive, where everything depends upon nominis confessio or negatio.

³ Even Paul thinks of the Christ as king, 1 Cor. xv. 24, iv. 8. Attestation of the name, Eus. 4, 15 (Polycarp).

tribute.¹ This silence is not fully explained by Jesus's imperfect familiarity with the Greek language. Nor are we to take it as an evidence that Jesus thought his kingdom must eventually overturn Rome; for he left the final solution of this question to God, without any interference of his own, and above all without a thought of the intervention of human power. But, in view of his subsequent silence, as well as of his tragical fundamental conviction that his mission had been allowed by God to be wrecked upon the determined opposition of the leaders of the people, we must recognize in the whole of this enigmatical behaviour the resignation which submitted to the accomplished destiny, and never thought for a moment of seeking the assistance of the Romans to escape the hands of the rulers of the people, whose persistent opposition would nevertheless still have irremediably put an end to his ministry. An Apostle Paul might protect himself against the violence of the Jews by the help of Rome, not only because his mental character was marked by moral energy rather than religious submission, but also because he sought his position among the Gentiles and not among the Jews. Jesus could have done so only if he had separated his person and his ministry from Judaism, with which he inseparably bound them even when he foresaw the breach and accepted for the accomplishment of his purpose a Gentile together with a Jewish body of adherents.

It was not because the principal accusation made no impression upon Pilate, but because passion and craftiness prompted them to complete the catalogue of guilt and to win success for their denunciation by one great stroke, that the high-priest, and—in order that nothing, and above all propriety and order,

¹ Hence Volkmar (p. 591) jumped to the conclusion that had Jesus been questioned he would necessarily have expressed himself concerning the spiritual sense of his Messiahship (therefore in the spirit of John's Gospel?). Had he been actually examined, he would have been pronounced innocent; therefore he was not examined at all (what a view of Roman procedure!), but simply executed as a rebel. Weisse, I. p. 456, found at least the surprising words *οὐ λέγει* to be only a short outline of the conversation (?). Grätz, III. p. 244, thought the Evangelists were not acquainted with the answer; *οὐ εἶπ.* is Yes and No!

might be wanting—first one and then another of the Sanhedrists, began afresh to tell of Jesus's numerous individual offences and to corroborate his claim to kingship.¹ They not merely did not hesitate to convert a matter which belonged entirely to the domain of religion into one altogether political, but they were audacious enough to bear witness to political crime. They spoke of his perverting women and children, of a systematic stirring up of the people from Galilee to Jerusalem, of an appeal to the nation to refuse tribute to Cæsar, of many other things which went to prove that Jesus was an outgrowth of the party which was dreaded equally by the Romans and the hierarchy, the party of that Judas of Galilee with the sanguinary resistance to which the Roman supremacy had begun.² That these assertions were not true, no one will now take the trouble to prove; and a very flagrant lie in an individual point that is capable of attestation, was the refusal of the tribute. If this lie had not been told, the charge of political instigation might have been excused in the presence of the combined influence of Messianism, opposition, and feverish religious agitation, as the natural inference of a divergent standpoint. Jesus allowed charge after charge to be heaped up against him; he did not interrupt, he did not

¹ Matt. xxvii. 12; Mark xv. 3. More in detail, Luke xxiii. 5, comp. 2.

² Luke gives (1) stirring up the people, (2) tribute (xxiii. 2), (3) stirring up the people from Galilee to Jerusalem (xxiii. 5). All this is very probable, though xxiii. 5 recalls Acts i. 22, x. 37 sqq., xvii. 6, xxi. 28. Interesting additions are given from Marcion by Epiph. *Schol.* 69 sq. (see De Wette, *Einl. N.T.* 6th ed. p. 131; Anger and Tisch. on Luke xxiii.; also Renan, 15th ed. p. 198). For instance, to Luke xxiii. 2 is added: (τ. ἔθνος) κ. καταλύοντα τ. νόμον κ. τ. προφ., an addition which occurs also frequently in the It. (solventem legem nostram et proph.). To Luke xxiii. 5 (Epiph. plainly inexact in verse 2, after φόρους): κ. ἀποστρέφοντα τ. γυναῖκας κ. τὰ τέκνα (It. c. e. add to verse 5: et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis, non enim baptizantur sicut et nos nec se mundant). These additions cannot be absolutely rejected. That about the law is more questionable than that about the women. If the former is not simply an interpolation of Marcion's, the despiser of the law (comp. It.), it appears in the mouth of the Jews before Pilate (despite Acts xviii. 13) as a very pedantic charge which (in the mouth of the Christian author) is explicable from Matt. v. 17. The charge about the women may, however, be ancient and genuine, and may have been suppressed in Christendom for the sake of decorum. The reproach had no immoral allusion, but referred to religious and in part social leading astray, upon which comp. Luke viii. 3. Comp. also *Acta Pil.* 1: λέγει ἑ. ὑὸν θεοῦ κ. βασιλέα· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σάββ. βεβηλωτὶ κ. τ. πάτρ. νόμον ἡμῶν βούλεται καταλῆσαι.

answer; not once did he tell them, "Ye lie!" He seemed to take the guilt upon himself; in fact, he was too great to dispute with falsehood and littleness, which however overcame him.

But, although according to Roman law silence was accounted acknowledgment of guilt, Pilate still required either public acknowledgment or denial: "Hearest thou not how many things these witness against thee?"¹ Yet even before the procurator Jesus was now silent. This is still more strange than his former silence, and than all his taciturnity before the Sanhedrim. Was he not bound to answer the highest terrestrial judge? Could he not, with reference to Pilate, overcome his disgust at the false accusations, which Pilate had not brought? As we here perceive, so to speak, a formal plan of Jesus to admit unconditionally the most weighty charge, and to meet silently all the rest, even the most unjust, one explanation among many others is possible, viz. that he wished to hasten, to force, his condemnation by his speaking and his silence, and particularly by refusing to answer the governor.² Yet this explanation is contradicted by the evident repugnance with which Jesus approached death, and by the fact that his silence produced the very opposite effect. It would therefore be more correct to say that he regarded the confession of his Messiahship before Jews and Gentiles as a duty, and thought it best to deny the criminal accusations by silence; to which perhaps it may be added that he was unwilling to disgrace the leaders of his nation before the Gentiles.³

¹ Donat. in Terent. *Eun.* 3, 2, 23: taciturnitas confessionis genus est, præsertim contra adversarii interrogationem. Geib, p. 274.

² Weisse, I. p. 460, suggests that Jesus, by his silence, intentionally brought about the execution of the verdict. Yet, p. 461, he himself qualifies this by saying it was at the same time the only right and becoming course.

³ Whilst Strauss and Volkmar mainly follow in the wake of Is. liii. 7, most critics recognize the intentional character and the deep significance of the silence. Schleierm., p. 429, sees in it a definite declaration of the nullity of the charges. Schenkel, p. 301. Weisse, see previous note. Steinmeyer, p. 150, avoids the question (perhaps on account of the Johannine confusion of the speaking and silence). In a certain sense is applicable here what Cicero says, *De Orat.* 1, 54: Socrates, quum omnium sapientiss. esset sanctissimeque vixisset, ita in judicio capitis pro se dixit, ut non supplex aut reus, sed magister aut dominus videretur esse judicum.

And it is remarkable that the governor understood this silence. From this very silence there came to him a light which gave a very different aspect to the dangerous pretension to kingship. He did not infer guilt or obstinacy from the silence, as the official and imperious consciousness even of a mild Pliny the Younger was apt so quickly to do: an evidence this of Pilate's intelligence, and still more of the impression produced by the Lord even when he uttered no words.¹ The Gospels say the governor marvelled that Jesus did not answer a syllable.² That this astonishment was favourable to Jesus, the sequel showed. It is true that Pilate recognized neither the Messiah nor merely the great man, and it was not to be supposed he would; but he saw that this plain man, in the dress of the people, calmly taciturn and without fanaticism in word, bearing or countenance, could not be such a rebel and instigator of the people as he had been described. Pilate might have held him capable of unrestrained and foolish superstition, of which at the very commencement of his official duties he had discovered signs in the whole nation, and an eloquent testimony to which is to be found in the irony of the inscription he caused to be put upon the cross; he did not, however, think him guilty of a dangerous crime, but on the other hand readily perceived the envious jealousy of the hierarchy.³

Whilst Pilate was thus considering, and there was a pause which, in spite of all the exertions of Jesus' opponents, might bring about a favourable turn in the trial—particularly as an offer of money from Jesus's adherents, from such as Joseph of Arimathæa, might have given preponderance to the milder feelings of the governor—there came forward a stream of people

¹ Who does not remember the letter of Pliny to Trajan, during the persecution of the Christians, in A.D. 113: *neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset, quod faterentur, pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri* (10, 97). And Marc. Aurel. 11, 3: *ψιλή παράταξις*.

² Matt. xxvii. 13 sq.; Mark xv. 4 sq.

³ Pliny, 10, 97: *nihil aliud inveni, quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam*. Pilate himself: *ὑπερθauμάσας τὸ τῆς δεισιδαιμ. ἄκρατον*, Jos. B.J. 2, 9, 3. Envy, Matt. xxvii. 18; Mark xv. 10.

who had little directly to do with the cause of Jesus.¹ Whether it was known in the city that Pilate—as might have been customary on this day—was sitting on his tribunal, or whether it was without knowledge of this and quite spontaneously that the people came to address him, it was a fact that crowds flocked to the upper city, to the tribunal, with the request that the governor, probably according to a usage that prevailed at the Easter festival, would release one of the prisoners condemned to death.² Here we have a remarkable fact, of which we have no information elsewhere.³ It shows incontrovertibly that it was usual for executions to take place at festival times, particularly at Easter, and that the idea of the festival of the Passover, and of the deliverance of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt, had been appropriately taken advantage of to save the life of a condemned man. So much provisionally.⁴ Mark gives the best account of this,

¹ See Pilate's venality, above, II. p. 224. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 58, and Acts xxiv. 26. Jos. *Ant.* 20, 9, 5.

² Mark xv. 8 (Matt. xxvii. 15). Luke, xiii. 13, makes the people present from the beginning; in Matt. verses 15, 20, they come thither suddenly. Comp. the four gates on the west of the temple, leading, one to the palace, two to the suburbs, and one to the rest of the city; *Ant.* 15, 11, 5, and above, p. 79.

³ Schöttgen, p. 235, quotes from *Pesach.* f. 91, 1, the analogy, that even for him cui promiserunt eductionem e carcere, agnus pasch. mactatur. This somewhat indefinite (therefore rejected by Paulus and Langen) allusion receives confirmation from a passage in Josephus, which has not yet been quoted, where at the time of the *ἑορτή* (without doubt Easter) the robbers ask, and by the aid of the high-priest obtain, from Albinus the release of ten of their associates; *Ant.* 20, 9, 3.

⁴ It has long been disputed whether this custom was Jewish or Roman. There is no trace of it in the Old Testament; but the Roman *lectisternia* are not sufficiently analogous, for, according to Livy, 5, 14, only *in eos dies* demta vincula from the prisoners. Quite as little are the instances of release by the procurators, *Ant.* 20, 9, 5, Acts xxiv. 26, to be adduced. Nevertheless Grotius, Baumg.-Crus., Meyer, Friedlieb, as well as Mangold, A. Bar., have referred back to the Romans; Augustus is held to have ordered it in gratiam Judæorum. Similarly Schleierm., p. 433, regards it as a mollifying set-off against the unjust confiscation of the country, which had engendered many *ἁγροί*. Paulus, *l.c.*, Langen, p. 271 (Steinm. p. 133), and particularly Ewald, p. 570, more correctly think of the idea of the Passover festival; and I shall further establish this below. How quickly again (whilst Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 501 hurries on with only a word) Volkmar here decides that we have no trace of this custom, and that the best analogy, lying at the base of the invention, is found in the two rams of the day of atonement (pp. 590 sqq.)! Though Matt. and Mark ascribe the custom to Pilate, it is plain that it did not originate with him. Comp. Luke (necessity) and John (Jewish custom), in the following note.

whilst the other sources, Matthew taking the lead, represent Pilate as spontaneously conceiving the idea of offering to the people the release of a prisoner, and if possible of Jesus.¹ This account—in distinction from that of Mark, which shows the crowding in of the people—is certainly to be rejected, because Pilate would hardly have first thought of the grace symbolized by the festival ceremonies, or have suggested the possibility of releasing such a dangerous criminal as Barabbas, or, without any prompting incident, have proposed the release of Jesus before the trial had come to an end and had resulted in condemnation.²

This demand of the people was in the highest degree inopportune for the hierarchy, who had not prompted it, though we might have suspected them of doing it. It is possible that the people begged for the release of Jesus, then on his trial. But for Pilate the demand was opportune; and the idea at once occurred to him of cutting short the disagreeable process by setting free the harmless prisoner. "Will ye that I release unto you Jesus, the king of the Jews?" responded he, with an unhappy blending of scornful mockery of Jesus and the people with pity and complaisant yielding.³ The mockery might wound the feelings of the people; at any rate, the insult offered to this fettered king—who was, however, not recognized by the people—converted the mockery into a corrosive poison. And as if everything might yet be lost, the high-priests and Sanhedrists

¹ Mark xv. 8; Matt. xxvii. 15. Luke xxiii. 17, where mention is made of an ἀνάγκη, on the part of the governor, to release one at every feast, is wanting in A, B, L; but is found in Sin., Beza (after verse 19), St. Gall., It., Syr. Cur., Eus. Tisch., Meyer, and Bleek, hold it to be spurious; on the other hand, Langen (p. 272) bases his opinion of the indigenous Jewish origin of the custom upon this very passage and John xviii. 39 (συμῆθ, ἑμὶν). I hold the passage to be genuine and necessary (not at all harmonistic); it has been questioned either on account of ἀνάγκη or of the interruption of the dialogue.

² Afterwards Pilate took the initiative. Steinm., p. 140, unceremoniously rejects the initiative of the people.

³ Mark xv. 9 (comp. John xviii. 39) gives: king of the Jews. Matt. xxvii. 17: Ἰησ. λεγόμε. Χριστός (Matthew's style from i. 16 onwards). Pilate would hardly speak of "Christ," and to omit "called" would be harsher. Comp. Matt. itself, xxvii. 37.

exerted themselves with words and lungs and behaviour quickly to spread another watchword among the people: "Ask for Barabba!"¹ They mentioned the right name. "Barabba" had a good sound in the ears of the people. According to Matthew, he was a prominent or at least a notorious prisoner.² The son of a Scribe (Bar Abba, son of the father, that is of the Rabbi, a very common name among the Jews), he had probably been moved by religious fanaticism to take part in one of the numerous petty revolts that were continually disturbing the Roman rule.³ He was no common robber, as John says he was, and as were those criminals who, having been crucified with Jesus, were present to the imagination of the author; but, as Luke and Mark give it, he was a *stasiast*, a mover of sedition, and as such, doubtless in honour of Moses, had been an accomplice in the murder of persons favourable to the Romans or of

¹ Barabba, Greek name βαρραβᾶς (Mark xv. 7; John xviii. 40; Matt. xxvii. 16 sqq., has it five times, and Luke xxiii. 18 once, simply in the accusative — ἄν), is without exception written in the way given, in the Codd., Vers., Patr. (comp. Origen), even in the *Acta Pilati*. Only in It. ff. (Corb.) once rabbi arabam; in Tert. *Marc.* 4, 42, Barrabas. With the latter form agrees the reading of the Gospel of the Hebrews, in Jerome, upon this place: iste in evangelio, quod scribitur juxta Hebræos, *filius magistri eorum* interpretatur, that is, bar rabbon; it may be that the Gospel of the Hebrews read Rabbon, or added it as explanatory of barraba(o)n (Anger), or Jerome thus explained the barabban of the Gospel of the Hebrews (Hilg.), which, after Jerome's definite expression, is not probable. Whilst most recent critics (Olsh., De Wette, Meyer, Bleek, Strauss, Langen, and others) adhere to the reading of the ancient Codd., Ewald (p. 570) holds the text of the Gospel of the Hebrews to be more original, and Hilg., p. 68 (comp. his *Hebr.-Er.* p. 28), regards it as being at least as good as that of Matthew, more correctly of the whole of the Gospels. Renan, 15th ed. p. 419, and Aberle, p. 52, quite undecided. But Barabba is better attested; it is (also abbreviated Barba) nomen apud Talmud. usitatissimum (Lightfoot, p. 385), and it is easily explained (not so much, with Meyer, Mang., and others, as the son of Abba, for this name is not usual, as rather son of the father=son of the Rabbi or the Scribe). Thus Schol. Cod. S (Tisch. 8th ed. p. 195): πατρωνυμία τοῦ ληστοῦ ἦν ὁ Βαρ., ὕπερ ἐρμηνεύ. διδασκάλου ἱερός. Comp. V. pp. 206, 337. Buxt. p. 10: nomen honoris sicut Rabbi. Langen, p. 272, rightly reads Barabba, and yet explains it in the sense of Barabban. Barabba(o)n (for rabbon need not be discussed, whether it belongs to the Gospel of the Hebrews or was introduced as an explanation by Jerome) signifies factually the same (son of the great Rabbi), but it is simply the easier explanation, and may have been suggested by a misunderstanding of the accusative five times repeated in Matthew (thus most critics, from Paulus to Holtzm.; comp. Hilg. *L.c.*).

² Matt. xxvii. 16.

³ Comp. Luke xiii. 1 sqq. Above, IV. p. 119.

Roman soldiers.¹ His associates, possibly those Galileans whom Luke mentions in chap. xiii., may have been slain in the act or already executed. His life was, in the mean time, spared, either because he was a merely intellectual promoter of the sedition and was not discovered until afterwards, or because the intercession of his relations among the Scribes had procured for him at least an otherwise not unusual postponement of his execution until the Easter festival.² It was an accident of the most remarkable kind, and almost more than an accident, the irony of fate, of Providence, that a Barabba should have the honour of becoming the rival, the fortunate competitor, of Jesus. He also was called Jesus, besides possessing—what was again remarkable—the designation Bar Abba, i.e. “Son of the Father.” This similarity of name between Jesus and his rival was so repugnant to the Gospels, that, with the exception of Matthew, they are silent upon it.³ It is, perhaps, more remarkable still that, though

¹ John xviii. 40, comp. Matt. xxvii. 38. Also Weisse, I. p. 456.—Luke xxiii. 19; Acts iii. 14; Mark xv. 7 (Luke evidently simpler). *Στασιώτης* (Mark), as in Jos. *Ant.* 17, 9, 3: *στασιώτης*. Whether the addition in Jerome, *l.c.*, fil. mag. eorum interpret., qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus, originally belonged to the Gospel of the Hebrews (and then it would here be the source of Luke), or whether it was borrowed by that Gospel or by Jerome from Luke, cannot now be discovered. Hilg., *Hebr.-Ev.* p. 28, naturally believes in the original character of the Gospel of the Hebrews, and, according to his critical view of the Gospels, thinks first of Mark and next of Luke, though the latter stands first. Risings, above, I. p. 261. Tac. *Ann.* 12, 54.

² Collecting prisoners together, *Ant.* 20, 9, 5. *Sanh.* 10, 4: in custodia asservatur usque ad festum. Wetst. p. 514.

³ In Matt. xxvii. 16 sq., the reading *Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαρ.* is supported, since Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* 121 (Lomm. V. p. 35), by four codd. min., vers. Arm., Syr. (comp. Salom. Bassor. ap. Tisch.), and by the scholia of about twenty codices, in particular cod. S., where *παλαὶά πᾶν ἀντίγραφον* are appealed to in its favour. Certainly, Origen—who reads it first in verse 17—says: in multis exemplar. non continetur; and he half agrees with them (comp. above, II. p. 100), and finds it possible quod in hæresibus tale aliquid superadditum est, ut habeant aliqua convenientia dicere fabulis suis de similitudine nom. Jesu et Barabbæ. Finally, however, he adopts the name, and finds in it a mystery (the good and evil spirit in men). Griesb., Lach., recently also Tisch. (edd. 7 and 8), reject the reading, but for reasons which are far weaker than the ingenious supposition of Origen (comp. Bleek, II. p. 456; Meyer, *Matt.* p. 517). Langen, p. 272, also gives a very weak explanation of the “interpolation.” Jesus Bar. is accepted in particular by Fritzsche, *Lit. Blatt d. allg. K. Z.* 1843, p. 523. Also Rink, Olsh. (who finds here a divine lusio), Meyer, De Wette, Bleek, Sepp,

Barabba had been a political instigator of sedition, an adherent of the principles of Judas the Galilean, it was Jesus who was executed as guilty of treason, while it was Barabba whose release was successfully demanded.

It happened as the Sanhedrists wished. The people, naturally most of them Jerusalemites, in their repugnance to the contemptible kingship, in their love for the Pharisaic patriots, in servile obedience to their leaders, shouted for the release of Barabba.¹ In obedience to custom, Pilate was compelled to accept the decision of the people; but he still hoped that the life of Jesus might be saved. It was not necessary for him to consult the people concerning Jesus; he decided, however, to appeal from the Sanhedrists to the people, in order to obtain a pretext for releasing Jesus which would justify him before the hierarchy and the emperor. He hoped that the grace which had been so copiously exercised towards Barabba, the unusual permission to pronounce upon the destiny of a second, the natural benevolence of the people and the joyous mood of the festival crowds, together with the popular attitude of which Jesus had been accused, would combine to bring about the release of the latter.² Thus it became still more necessary that the first success of the Sanhedrists should be crowned by a second. And if the existing feeling against the powerless and despised Messiah, and the already exhibited partizanship of the people, were not sufficient to serve the purpose of the Sanhedrists, it happened—apart from any further attempt by the latter to give the tone to public feeling—that the next unlucky question of the governor accom-

Ewald, Weizs., A. Schweizer. It is indeed conceivable that the word has dropped out because of the suspicions which Origen already showed; and it is less probable that the Gnostics inserted it into the ecclesiastical codices. But we cannot afford to give up the whole as a myth because of these remarkable names. Who dismisses the prophet of misfortune, Jesus the son of Hannas, in *B. J.* 6, 5, 3?

¹ The unfortunate opinion of Tisch. (*Pilati judicio quid lucis affer. ex act. Pil.* 1855, pp. 19 sq.) is thereby at once set aside, viz., that the people had appeared before the tribunal rather for the sake of releasing Jesus. Comp. Langen, p. 265.

² Weizs., p. 566, thinks that Pilate concerned himself a great deal about Jesus, only because he was reluctant to release Barabba.

plished the work of arousing the wished-for passion and fury: "What will ye that I shall do to him whom ye call the king of the Jews?"¹ "Crucify him!" was the cry from all sides at once; and the appeal, at last an earnest one, made for Jesus by the bewildered governor, "What evil, then, has he done?" was necessarily answered by a stronger and tumultuous outburst of "Crucify him!"² Eusebius mentions a very similar case in the Diocletian persecution, when amid the shouts of the amphitheatre a murderer was released and a Christian thrown to the wild beasts.³ Instead of manfully stemming the tide of popular fury and showing himself in the presence of the complot a contemptuous Roman in Cicero's sense, Pilate, satisfied with his good intention, accommodating himself to the impossible and yielding to his old fear of the people, renounced any further resistance. He set Barabba free; at 8 a.m., not 12 at noon, after a process that had lasted one hour, not six hours, he pronounced upon Jesus, at the demand of the people and according to Roman custom, his "Condemno," the orally given sentence that has been handed down with an appearance of literal exactness in the Acts of Pilate, to the effect that Jesus, for pretending to the kingship of the Jews, should be scourged with rods and then crucified. Probably the Roman form was briefly this: "Thou shalt go to the cross!"⁴ Pilate overlooked the fact that his irresolution, and

¹ Mark xv. 12; Matt. xxvii. 22.

² Matt. has twice: "Let him be crucified!" Luke xxiii. 18: *αἶρε* (mechēh, Ex. xxxii. 32), as in Acts xxii. 22, and Eus. 4, 15 (Smyrna), *α. τ. ἀθέουσ.* Luke, Mark: "Crucify!" (according to Luke, in a double cry). The *πάλιν* of Mark xv. 13 only explicable from Luke xxiii. 18 (Mark xv. 11). Luke xxiii. 23 well adds: *κατ' ὄχλ. αἰ φωναὶ ἄ.*

³ Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 6.

⁴ By the factious and tumultuous shouting we are reminded of Paul. *Sent.* 5 tit. 22: *autores seditionis et tumultus concitato populo pro qualitate dignitatis aut in crucem tolluntur aut bestiis subjiuntur.* But against Jewish tumults Pilate had no longer any courage in the sense of Cicero, *Flacc.* 28: *multitudinem Judæorum, flagrantem nonnunquam in concionibus, pro republ. contemnere gravitatis summæ fuit.*—The Gospels, Matt. xxvii. 26, Mark xv. 15, give no formula of condemnation (as usual, Friedl. p. 125; Geib, p. 148); they only say, "he scourged him and delivered him to be crucified." Luke xxiii. 25: "delivered him up to their will." Petron. *Sat.* 112: *ibis in crucem.* *Acta Pil.* c. 9 (with the addition: crucifixion in the garden of the

still more his heartlessness in giving a perverse and malicious expression to his best impulses, had decided the fate of Jesus.¹

Such is the trial before Pilate, in its briefest and most probable form, as it is found preserved in Matthew and Mark. As might have been expected, amplifications have been forced upon this most ancient form. The decisive event itself would challenge a more detailed description; the innocence, the greatness of Jesus, the culpable conduct of his foes, could be individualized in many ways; and in what way better than by the more detailed exhibition of the conscientiousness and pity of the Gentiles, represented primarily by Pilate, and appearing to earn by their piety towards Jesus that admission into the Christian Church and that precedence of the Jews which followed close upon the death of Jesus? It is thus that we are able to explain the additions to the history of the trial that are to be found in the Gospels themselves, and in their fullest extent in the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus, or more correctly in the Acts of Pilate.²

The editor of Matthew begins the glorification of the Gentiles. It is very evident that he has interpolated first the mediation of Pilate's wife for Jesus, and then at the close of the trial the symbolic protestation of Pilate that he washed his hands in innocence.³ While Pilate was sitting on his tribunal, his wife sent

arrest, and with Dysmas and Gestas). Sentence differently given Adrichom. *Theatr. terr. s.* p. 163 (from ancient annals!): contemptorem Caesaris et falsum Messiam—cruci affigite. I licitor, expedi crucees. Friedl. p. 125. John gives erroneously the sixth hour, and Wies. *Beitr.* p. 252, places the maltreatment by the soldiers at 6 a.m.

¹ *ἀνὰρῆπια*, already in *Ap. Const.* 5, 14. Violentia suffragiorum extorserunt, Tert. *Ap.* 21. On the other hand, Cicero, *Flacc.* 28, previous note.

² Already Origen upon Matt., 122, finds in Pilate's wife *mysterium ecclesiae ex gentibus*: quae aliquando quidem regebatur a Pilato, nunc autem jam non est sub eo propt. fidem s. in Christo.

³ The interpolation in Matt. xxvii. 19 (Pilate's wife) is mentioned above, I. p. 84. Thus also Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 68. The disturbance of the text of Matt. extends to verse 21, for verse 21 init. is clearly a repetition of verse 17. The second interpolation (washing of hands) is betrayed less by marks of junction with the rest than by its definite allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem, in the manner of Luke (Matt. xxvii. 25). Since Holtzmann, *Bib.-Lex.* IV. p. 140, finds my distinction of two later hands somewhat arbitrary, he must prove it against my careful treatment of the subject.

to him: "Have nothing to do with that righteous man, for I have suffered many things in a dream because of him!" Without having seen Jesus, the "gentle" Galilean of Renan, and without being a Jewess, into which "Procla" is converted in the Acts of Pilate, she had received a revelation from God (according to later writers, from the devil), as the Magi did, or Joseph (both figures of the editor's) in the time of the infancy of Jesus: to lay hands upon the righteous would be a punishable wickedness!¹ In the Greek menologies she is, for this, made a Christian saint.² Her intercession does three things: it shows the innocence of Jesus, it explains Pilate's hesitation with regard to Jesus, it makes the approaching call of the Gentiles by God intelligible. Pilate's handwashing also is nowhere attested out of Matthew. Its unhistorical character can be established, against those who defend it, by arguing that Pilate, the man of blood, would certainly not thus shrink from murder, that the enemy of Jewish customs would assuredly not adopt a Jewish usage in word and

¹ On the expression, comp. *Bab. Taan. f. 25, 2*: cum aggrederetur rex Sapo- res Rabbam affligere, misit ad eum mater ejus dicens: nihil tibi sit cum isto Judeo. Lightfoot, p. 385. Classical parallel in the dream-warning of Calpurnia before the assassination of Cæsar, Val. Max. 1. 7; Wetst. p. 530; Tholuck, p. 371. The wife of Pilate appears as proselyte, *Acta Pil.* 2 (Θυγατρις) ἡ τοῦ Πιλάτου. Thus Tisch., Langen, Meyer, Bleek. The name Procla or Claudia Procla, by the second hand in chap. 4. The name badly explained by Paulus (see Meyer); we should rather think of Proculus, Livy, 1. 16, or Procula, Juv. 2, 68 (πρόκλη). Thilo's conjecture concerning Pilate, above, p. 82. Governors accompanied by their wives, contrary to ancient rule, Tac. *Ann.* 3, 33; Suet. *Aug.* 24. Comp. Tholuck, p. 357. The dream of the wife is ascribed to God by Origen upon Matt. 122: qui voluit per visum convertere Pilati uxorem, ut, quantum ad se, vetaret virum s., etc. Res div. providentiæ laudem continens. According to Ignatius, *Philipp.* 4, the devil wished to set aside the cross of Jesus. The Jews, again (*Acta Pilati*, 2), spoke of a magical potion, which the God Jesus had given her. According to *Natürl. Gesch.* p. 129, the friends of Jesus went to Porcia (!), who, however, had already had her dream. According to Henneberg, p. 212, she awoke on account of the disturbance, slept again and then dreamt; a correction of Paulus and Olsh., according to whom she dreamt upon the proceedings of the evening. According to Langen, p. 275, the dream was not divine, but providential. Renan's fancy, 15th ed. p. 416. Schleierm., Tholuck, Olsh., Neander, Bleek, Krabbe, Meyer, Press., Langen, Steinm., wish to retain the incident. Strauss (who finds it original in Matt., passed over in Mark), Weiss. Ewald, &c., treat it as a myth. Weiss (p. 459) thinks of confusion with the Drusilla of the Acts; Volkmar (p. 596), of a contrast to Herodias.

² Langen, p. 275.

action, and that the horrible response of the people, "His blood be upon us and our children!" is simply the interpolation of an author who believed he had witnessed the terrible Nemesis of God in the fall of the nation a generation later.¹

Luke seeks to increase the guilt of the Sanhedrists by placing, by the side of the heathen governor, the Jewish ruler of Jesus as a witness of the innocence of the latter. We are thereby reminded of Luke's attempt to construct the Church out of Gentiles and Jews; for which purpose he shows us, at the birth of Jesus, not only Magi, but also Simeon and Anna, worshipping, and at and after the crucifixion, besides the Romans, not the hierarchy, it is true, but the Jewish people, mourning and in fact repenting. As the defender of the claims of the Gentiles, Luke has described Pilate with even more favour than Antipas. Thrice, nay four times, Pilate pleads for Jesus with increasing earnest-

¹ Matt. xxvii. 24 sq. The usage together with the words in Deut. xxi. 6; Jos. Ant. 4, 8, 16; Sot. 8, 6 (the same concrete case in all). The words also 2 Sam. iii. 28; Susanna, 46; Acts xx. 26, xviii. 6. The washing of the Seventy translators, Ant. 12, 2, 13, does not apply here at all (against Friedl. p. 123). That this custom had a wider application is shown by Ps. xxvi. 6, lxxiii. 13. The meaning of the proceeding was, according to Jos. Ant. 4: καθαρὰς χεῖρας ἔχειν ἀπὸ τ. φόρον. Schol. Sot. 8, 6: quemadm. manus nostræ mundæ, ita et nos mundi a cæde illius. Wetst. p. 531. Among the Greeks and Romans existed only the custom of washing the hands or the body after actual murder (οὐ καθαρὸς τὰς χεῖρας, Herodotus, 1, 35). Thus Virgil, Æn. 2, 719 sq.: donec me flum. vivo abluero. Ovid, Fast. 2, 45 sq.: ah nimium faciles, qui tristia crimina cædis fluminea tolli posse putetis aqua. This custom is expressly attested by Schol. Soph. Aj. Mast. 663: ἔθος ἦν παλαιοῖς, ὅτε φόρον, &c., ἐποίουν, ἕκαστὶ ἀπονίπτειν τ. χεῖρας εἰς κάθαρσιν τοῦ μύσματος. Ebrard and Bleek appeal to this as a parallel. Another parallel might be found in the protestation of the judge, before passing sentence, that he was guiltless of the blood of the condemned (Ap. Const. 2, 52); but against this parallel—which is adduced by Thilo and Heberle, and approved even by Meyer—the valid objection can be brought that the hands were not washed. Origen upon Matt. 124, very rightly found: judaico usus est more, faciens non sec. aliq. consuetud. Romanorum. Thus held also Rosemüller, De Wette, Friedl., Aberle; on the other hand, Wolff, Ebrard, Bleek, Heberle, Meyer, Steinm., maintained that it was also in conformity with heathen custom. Fritzsche and Langen thought it might also occur to a heathen. But would Pilate have also used Jewish words (ἀθῶτος, Ps. xxvi. lxxiii.; also 2 Sam. iii. 28; Sus. 46)? Paulus thought the author had put into Pilate's lips what seemed to him probable (also the δίκαιος, which is wanting in the purified text, notwithstanding Sin., Alex.). Since Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 504, this incident has been held doubtful, even by Ewald, p. 572. The cry of the people, after Joel iii. 4; Ez. iii. 18; Obadiah i. 15; Acts xviii. 6.

ness.¹ At the beginning, when the question of kingship has been mooted, he answers the high-priests: "I find no guilt in this man."² When they heap up accusations, he sends Jesus, as a Galilean instigator of sedition, to the ruler of his province, and the conclusion is again that he is not worthy of death, but as a concession to their strong feeling Pilate will scourge him, and then let him go.³ As they next ask for the release of Barabba instead of Jesus, he calls the opponents once more before him. They shout their "Crucify!" but he for the third time repeats: "I have found nothing in him worthy of death!" and again proposes to scourge him.⁴ Antipas also—to return to him—insisted upon the innocence of Jesus. It is true his treatment of him was not very noble.⁵ Jesus was most joyfully received by Antipas in his residence close at hand, the Asmonean castle on the east, since Antipas had long wished to see him, because—as the Evangelist says—he hoped to witness a miracle, which at another time he had been afraid of.⁶ His disappointment was great, for Jesus, with as much pride as justice, refused to answer any of his questions. The zealous accusations of the Sanhedrists, too tedious for the court, afforded no indemnification. The petty prince took revenge for his disappointment and his mortification by indulging in the only pastime which remained. He, with his officers and body-guard, maltreated and insulted Jesus, whom he no longer feared, by causing him to be clothed in a white state dress, a royal robe, and sending him back thus to Pilate with the message that he found the man not

¹ (1) Luke xxiii. 4; (2) xxiii. 14—16; (3) xxiii. (a) 20, (b) 22. ² Luke xxiii. 4.

³ Luke xxiii. 5—16. On the different uses of scourging, see below on the scourging of Jesus.

⁴ Luke xxiii. 18—22.

⁵ Schleirm., p. 436, also thought thus, though he retained the incident.

⁶ Matt. xiv. 1 sq. The Asmonean palace, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 16, 3. Antipas was often at the feasts (above, I. pp. 270 sq., 307), and now after the death of Philip (A.D. 33, 34) his was the only crowned head of the house of Herod. It is remarkable that Friedl., p. 108, gives him Machærus as his customary residence; and Lichtenstein, *L. J.* p. 432, and Aberle, p. 39, make him dwell in the same palace with Pilate. Even Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 298, finds it possible that Antipas, and not Pilate, dwelt in the palace of Herod.

dangerous. At the same time he thanked Pilate for an attention which had so happily broken the ice of their mutual alienation.¹

This account looks more historical than all the others. The contemptibleness and insignificance of this court of Antipas, the alienation and reconciliation with the procurator, seem to be capitally well painted.² Moreover, besides the Gospel, a source of the Acts of the Apostle—but not Paul—refers to the co-operation of Pilate and Antipas; only in a very different manner, since Pilate and Antipas appear confederated *against* Jesus, a conception which is probably the older of the two, for even in the Gospel it is only by violence converted into the contrary one.³ It is, however, beyond doubt that Antipas did not

¹ What is the *ἰσθῆς λαμπρά*? Vulg. (thus also Luther and the Zür. Bib.) has indutum veste alba; Pesch., on the other hand, purpurea. Beza, Wetst., Kuin., De Wette, Friedl., Langen, Lange, white. Lightfoot (erroneously quoted by Langen), and others, purple. Meyer and Bleek, undecided. It is said that *λαμπρ.* is a neutral expression (Luke xvi. 19; James ii. 2), and that Luke uses *λευκός* for white (thus Lightfoot, pp. 562, 673), Luke ix. 29; Acts i. 10. But besides the evidence in Wetst. pp. 812 sq., Acts x. 30, xxvi. 13, also Rev. xv. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 16; these allow us to think only of white. King Solomon had, besides a purple (comp. *Ant.* 17, 8, 3; 18, 6, 6), a white state robe, *Ant.* 8, 7, 3 (consequently the lily, Matt. vi. 28, above, III. pp. 32 sq., can be differently explained); Archelaus went in white state dress to the assembling of the nation in the temple, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 1, 1; the royal robe of Agrippa I. (the pseudo-Messiah) was silver white (silver brocade), *Ant.* 19, 8, 2, comp. Acts xii. 21. The people in white robes, *Ant.* 11, 8, 5. Also among the Romans the white garment was equal, nay, superior, to the purple as a festival dress, comp. Tac. *Hist.* 2, 89: *candida vestis* of the military commanders when they entered the Capitol; Val. Max. 1, 6, 11: in *proelium exeuntibus album aut purpur.* (paludam.) *dari solebat.* On the other hand, a *toga candida* (Polyb. 10, 4, 8, &c.) is (with Beza, Kuin., Friedl., Lange) not to be thought of (as if Jesus were a candidate for the Messiahship). The *στρατεύματα* are the *ἱπάρχαι καὶ σωματοφύλακες*, *B. J.* 2, 15, 1, which later also stood at the disposal of Bernice, sister of Agrippa I. Comp. the *σωμ.* and *δορυφόροι* of Herod, *Ant.* 15, 7, 3; 15, 9, 3; 17, 8, 3. The pages in Matt. xiv. 2 are not to be thought of. According to Theod. Mops. (Münt. p. 145; Fritzsche, p. 80), he treated Jesus as a foe.

² The alienation began in the circumstances themselves, for Antipas would have gladly possessed Judæa, his "heritage" (comp. my article *Herodier*, in *Bib.-Lex.*); it was materially increased, not by the occurrence in Luke xiii. 1, which Langen, p. 268, wrongly thinks happened in the territory of Antipas, but by the participation of Antipas in the complaint against Pilate (A.D. 32—34), see above, I. p. 307, and perhaps by secret reports sent to Tiberius, Jos. *Ant.* 18, 4, 5.

³ Acts iv. 27; Rev. xi. 10. Also in the *Anaph. Pil.* A. 6, Antipas appears among the accusers. Nothing can be proved from 1 Cor. ii. 8. Comp. Justin, *Trypho*, 103.

participate at all in the trial of Jesus, either in a friendly way or in a hostile one. The latter would have been more in harmony with historical probability, in so far as the prince was not only frivolous, but also beset by anxiety, and could not wish for the continuance in his country of the religious agitation caused by the ministry of him who in his miracles was the dreaded, and certainly never lightly-regarded, "risen Baptist." The silence of the other accounts concerning Antipas is significant.¹ An advance made by Pilate to Antipas, whom for years past he had hated with a deadly hatred, a partial renunciation of Roman supremacy within his own territory, to which the Messianic attempt exclusively belonged, is as improbable as the farcical sending back of Jesus by Antipas, the flagrant disparagement, if not of his own princely dignity doubly insulted by the mockery and by the caricature, yet of the dignity of the judicial court and of the procurator, who was favourable to the prisoner or at least had not yet said the last word.² If, moreover, we assume that the mocking of Jesus with the robe was, as we are told by the earlier accounts, the act of Roman soldiers and not of the court of Antipas, the impression is strengthened that the Antipas scene should be regarded as an historical picture newly composed of old material, and having its origin in the desire to see the local ruler of Jesus, who had of old been lying in wait, participate in bringing on Jesus's catastrophe.³ An older rancorous source, probably the Ebionite source, introduces Antipas, as well as Pilate, as the foe of Jesus, the derider of the Messiahship, like Herod the Great and the two Agrippas. Luke, true to his

¹ According to Krabbe, p. 492, passed over because without influence; on the other hand, according to Aberle, p. 29, Luke proceeded in a formal juridical way.

² How much more correct Acts xxv. 22 sqq.; and yet Agrippa II. was master of the temple!

³ The incident is rejected by Strauss, Weisse (at least Antipas did not mock Jesus), Baur, Schenkel; it is accepted even by Ewald, Hausr., Bunsen. It is disputed whether John knew of it, and where this scene is to be introduced in John—a diatribe between Tholuck, Olsh., De Wette, Meyer, Bleek, occasioned chiefly by Schleier., who held the (by Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 499) ridiculed opinion that Jesus was taken by a *back door* to Antipas, unseen by John.

aim, converts him, as well as Pilate, into a friend, in order doubly to put to shame both the accusation and the accusers.¹

The Gospel of John, lauded for its exactness, authenticity, and perspicuity, has, with its well-known dramatic art, in reality only more copiously developed the already-given unhistorical points of view of its predecessors.² It is quite in harmony with the character of this book that the sin of mankind against the Son of God is more vividly depicted; that on the part of Judaism no one, not even Antipas, interposes for Jesus; that even Pilate, the representative of the Christian tendency among the Gentiles, notwithstanding his restless intercession for Jesus, at least triply and quadruply bears the responsibility of his death; and that, by the side of and superior to the sin and weakness of men, the glory of Jesus is more distinctly revealed in evidences that dispel falsehood, disclose the truth, reveal a certain glance into destiny and the future, and unveil the secret of the Godhead itself to the trembling heathen.³ This Gospel, like Luke, exhibits three attempts to save Jesus made by Pilate, who goes as a mediator to and fro between the hierarchy without and the victim within the palace; indeed, when closely examined, Pilate's endeavours are seen to be doubled to six attempts.⁴ Of the three great attempts to save Jesus, the first is the result of Jesus's testimony about the kingdom of truth, the second of the impression produced by the speechless Lamb of God, the third of the influence of the testimony of the Son of God, whose con-

¹ Herod, Matt. ii. 1 sqq. Agrippa I., Acts xii. 1. Agrippa II., Acts xxvi. 28, 31 (perhaps imitated in the Gospel).

² Schleierm. *L. J.* p. 432: John alone gives the key; similarly, since, Bleek, Meyer, De Wette, Brückner, and others. According to Steinm., p. 143, John was ear-witness even in the palace; which Lücke, however, held was difficult, and explained with Schleiermacher-like art (Jesus remained at the entrance of the palace). Strauss, *l.c.* p. 497.

³ The guilt of Pilate, John xix. 11.

⁴ Aberle, p. 30, fancifully supposes that the Synoptics have made Pilate too friendly towards Jesus; hence, and for many other reasons, the supplementary account (pp. 41 sqq.).

demnation was permitted and yet would be avenged by One who was higher.¹

The reluctance of Pilate must show itself at the very beginning. Being a just judge, he asks for evidence, whilst the brutality of the Jews assumes that it would be enough to deliver up Jesus as a malefactor.² He then vainly wishes, as in Luke, to shake himself free of the trial; for in order to secure the execution of Jesus, the Jews require—as they assert with undisguised bloodthirstiness and yet only to the fulfilment of Jesus's own announcement of the cross—both the letter of their own law and the arm of the governor. Thus is the trial introduced, and then comes the first attempt to save Jesus. Pilate examines him concerning his kingdom. As the Jews have said nothing about this kingdom, Jesus, himself surprised, sees in this question a recognition of him brought about by God, and discloses to the governor—although the latter is scornfully reticent—the character of the kingdom that is not of this world, is not defended by worldly servants, but is the kingdom of the preaching of the truth for the children of the truth.³ Pilate wards off the force of this answer by putting his Greco-Roman sceptical question, "What is truth?" But he at once announces to the Jews, "I find no guilt in him at all;" and adopts the

¹ The divisions in John are: A.—First examination at the governor's palace: (a) Pilate and the Jews, xviii. 28—32; (b) Pilate and Jesus, xviii. 33—37; (c) Pilate and the Jews, xviii. 38—40. B.—The scourging: (a) the scourging, xix. 1—3; (b) "Ecce Homo," xix. 4—6; (c) "Filius Dei," xix. 7—12. C.—Tribunal decision, xix. 12—16. Under A, the attempt to save Jesus reaches its climax in xviii. 38 sq.; under B are three attempts, xix. 4, 6, 12, the more important being the two in verses 4 and 12; under C are two feeble repetitions of previous attempts, verses 14 and 15. Therefore six attempts, of which three are great ones (Schenkel, p. 300, speaks of four).

² John xviii. 29 sqq. It is upon this verse that De Wette's (comp. Schleier.) assertion is based, that Pilate already knew of Jesus. Above, p. 84, n. 2.

³ John xviii. 34 (comp. xix. 11) strongly reminds us of xi. 51. But the miracle is artificially derived from the Synoptics, Matt. xxvii. 11. In John, however, it is evidently assumed (against Schenkel, p. 297) that the Jews had not urged the elucidatory accusation, xviii. 30, 34 sq. King of truth, xviii. 36 sq. In verse 37, the reading should not be *ὁκρουν* (Beza and others), but *ὁκροῦν*, as Jesus's affirmative answer shows.

expedient of offering to them the Easter gift of the release of this prisoner.¹ The Jews demand Barabba, and Pilate resorts to a second expedient. He allows Jesus to be scourged, and when robed as Messiah to be maltreated by the soldiers; but the fury is to exhaust itself in this ignominious maltreatment of him who was led forth in a purple mantle and crowned with thorns. "Behold the man! I find no guilt in him at all!"² Then, when they cry out their "Crucify!" he speaks once more and dejectedly: "Take ye him and crucify him; I find no guilt in him!"³ The retort of the Jews that according to their law he ought to die, leads him to make a third attempt to save him. The very charge they urge, viz. that Jesus has made himself Son of God contrary to the law, raises to its highest point the profound anxiety of his soul before the prisoner.⁴ "Whence art thou?" he asks, probing the mystery and the proud silence of Jesus. The humiliating answer to the governor who is about to exercise his supreme authority over life and death, that the power which that governor possesses over him—Jesus—is only given him from above, and therefore the sin of those who have delivered up the prisoner to the slaying executive is a double sin,—this answer drives Pilate to resolve upon a release at any price.⁵ But the stronger his appeal, the stronger grows the Jewish opposition. The defender of the Son of God yields when menaced with the animosity of the emperor.⁶ Pilate is no longer able to stand against the terrible difficulty: the Son of God against

¹ On the sceptical question, see Pliny, *His. Nat.* 2, 5: *solum inter ista certum, nihil esse certi.* Comp. Neander, p. 566; Steinm. p. 137; Aberle, p. 47.

² *Ecce homo*, John xix. 5, 14. This is (sympathetically said) no usurper (Neander, Meyer).

³ According to Aberle, p. 56, he would have made no objection to stoning. Comp. Tholuck, quoted above, p. 75, n. 2.

⁴ Aberle, p. 57, quite perverted (also contradictory, p. 26).

⁵ John xix. 7—12.

⁶ On the title *Amicus Cæsaris*, *φίλος βασιλέως*, among Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Syrians, Romans, comp. Jos. *Ant.* 14, 10, 2; 19, 5, 3, &c. Therefrom *φίλος Θεοῦ*, Wisdom vii. 27; James ii. 23; John xv. 13 sqq. Wetst. p. 952. Aberle, p. 60, looks for the general sense: no adherent of the dynasty.

Cæsar, king against emperor. Breaking off his mediation, allowing destiny to fulfil itself, he now solemnly takes his seat upon the tribunal. And yet even now he resists, feebly it is true, discouraged and hopeless, but almost ready to believe in the King of the Jews, and according to Tertullian verily a Christian in his conscience.¹ Once more he speaks: "Behold your king!" and when the cry of the cross is repeated, he again asks, "Shall I crucify your king?" When with annihilating emphasis and like a reproach of rebellion on his own part, but also with a complete renunciation of all Messianic belief, the high-priests respond, "We have no king, but the emperor," he delivers Jesus up to them to be crucified.²

The ingenious report of this Gospel, by its copiousness, perspicuity and vivacity, still more by its profound, far-seeing and super-Jewish ideas and striking points in a history which every one follows unweariedly and breathlessly, far surpasses the dry and scanty narratives of the earlier writers in enlisting lay sympathy. And from the standpoint of sober science, we might find two features very happily, in truth both philosophically and historically, preserved, viz. the delineation of the Gentile with his contempt of the Jews, his scepticism, his consciousness of power, yet also his dawning sense of higher powers; and the description of his subjection of the higher powers to the name of Cæsar, to that dread of appeal to Rome which for several years kept his attacks upon the nation in check.³ But there is very much more that looks incredible. The shrewd Jews or the suppliant Sanhedrim cannot, whatever may have been their conceitedness, have approached a procurator, a Pilate, from the commencement with so much haughtiness, with so foolhardy a

¹ Tert. *Ap.* 21 (certainly with reference to the apocryphal report of Pilate to the emperor Tiberius, which itself, however, in part grew out of John): *Pilatus et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus.* On recent critics, see Steinm. p. 144.

² Comp. Acts xvii. 7. Tac. *Ann.* 3, 38: *majestatis crimen omnium accusationum complementum erat.* Suet. *Tib.* 61: *p. Sejani interitum (A.D. 31) vel sævissimus exstitit.—Nemini delatorum fides abrogata.*

³ Above, p. 84, n. 2; p. 104, n. 2.

withholding of the charge against him whom they accused.¹ It would have been contrary to all Roman gravity, strictness, and dignity, for a governor to make himself a veritable peripatetic, going to and fro between the parties. All we know of the history of Pilate contradicts the supposition that he would have been so gentle, so indulgent even to weakness towards the Jews, so touchingly anxious for the saving of a Jew who had dreamt of royalty, so compassionate, so profoundly sensitive, as the cry "Ecce homo!" makes him appear. He could not have shown himself at once so imprudent and characterless as to wish to save Jesus, and yet to mock him as the King of the Jews, and that not once only, as in Mark, but again and again from beginning to end, and then to deliver him up to the thus subtly inflamed rage of the Jews.² A scoffing sceptic could not have been thus dominated and paralyzed by a sense of the existence of higher powers, and still less likely was he to have discovered the correct title of the Messiah by revelation or accident. Finally as to Jesus. The taciturn prisoner did not indulge in such long confessions before Pilate, confining his silence to a moment at the close; and least of all did he guard himself against being suspected of seeking a temporal kingdom, after the manner of an apologist of the second century.³ The impression that the account is unhistorical is completed by a comparison with the earlier Gospels. Indeed, a comparison with

¹ Langen, p. 257, thinks that the sensitiveness and defiant attitude of the Jews may be explained by the probable fact that the right of capital punishment was not taken from them before the time of Pilate (comp. the forty years before the destruction). This is erroneous according to above, p. 75, n. 3. Aberle, pp. 36 sqq., is better: their defiant attitude was due to their continual attempt to circumvent the procurator, and particularly to confine his independent inquiry to a mere ratification. But queens barefoot (above, p. 85)!

² Comp. Mark xv. 9. Matt. has only *λεγόμε. Χρ.* Luke has nothing of the kind.

³ Justin, *Ap.* 1, 11: *ἀκούσαντες βασιλείαν προσδοκῶντας ἡμᾶς ἀκρίτως ἀνθρώπινον λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὑπερίληφαι.* Comp. the heavenly kingdom, above, IV. p. 284. Schenkel, p. 298, thought that Jesus thus spoke on another occasion; Weizs. p. 566, that he spoke to this effect. But Weisse (pp. 458 sqq.) has very rightly condemned the verbosity of Jesus, and has mentioned in particular the Johannine use of the dialogue. Schenkel has also expressed himself against the loquacity of Jesus.

the established facts repeated even by John—such as the actual execution of Jesus with criminals, or the inscription of Pilate—is sufficient to supply arguments against John. The brief account of the condemnation of Jesus has become more and more verbose; remote facts and words have been artificially introduced and ingeniously and for a purpose re-shaped and modified; the already unhistorical exaggerations in Luke and Mark have been again exaggerated. We may therefore decline the vain search after a more copious and a purer history. The great confession of Jesus before Pilate carries its own evidence of being borrowed from the hall of the Sanhedrim and from the arrest in Gethsemane, with a complete modernizing of the Messianic idea. The scourging is not only proposed as a means of saving Jesus—as in Luke—but is actually thus carried out. The maltreatment of Jesus by the soldiers is placed in the midst of the proceedings—as in Luke, and yet differently—instead of correctly in the interval between the sentence and the crucifixion. The question of release makes its appearance at the beginning, and the silence of Jesus at the end. We need not continue our enumeration in order to establish firmly and unassailably against this new representation the charge of perplexing arbitrariness.¹

But outside of our Gospels, the “Acts of Pilate” have made use of the whole of the material of the four Gospels in the construction of a yet more elaborate representation of the trial of Jesus. It is remarkable that this book has made most use of the fourth Gospel, and in fulness of treatment is most like it, although it is but just to say that the talent, independence, profundity and moderation of that Gospel are altogether wanting in this gross and fanciful mosaic work. It may suffice briefly to enumerate the most interesting novelties of this much-knowing apocryphal book, whose roots go back to the second century, and whose account of Jesus’s death forms a fraternal counterpart

¹ Comp. only John xviii. 36 sqq. with Matt. xxvi. 53, 64; John xix. 1 and Luke xxiii. 16; John xix. 2 and Matt. xxvii. 28 sqq., Luke xxiii. 11.

to the Gospels of the Infancy.¹ In the first place, the accusation is amplified. The accusing Sanhedrists are mentioned by name, Annas and Caiaphas, with eight others, among whom Gamaliel, Judas, Levi, Naphtali, Alexander and Jairus are prominent. The points of the indictment are more fully formulated—divine sonship, kingship, Sabbath-breaking, annulling the Law.² The trial is of longer duration, and the offences of bastardy, of flight into Egypt, of responsibility for the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem, are added and sought to be established.³ But the accusers are met by witnesses for the defence. It had been indeed only too striking that no one had bestirred himself in Jesus's behalf. The Jews had very early given currency to the report, that during the period of forty days (thus deliberately, thus orderly, had the trial been carried on) not one witness had appeared for Jesus. But here come such in crowds: Nicodemus with twelve witnesses, then the paralytic from the pool of Bethesda, a blind man, a hunchback, a leper, Veronica, the woman that had the issue of blood. Nay, troops of men and women cry, "This man is a prophet, the demons obey him, he called a Lazarus from the tomb." Nicodemus exerts himself even in the midst of the foes;

¹ The date of this book (above, I. p. 46) has recently been the subject of investigation by Scholten, *Aelt. Zeugnisse*, 1867, pp. 157 sqq., and since by Lipsius, *Die Pilatus-Akten*, Kiel, 1871. Yet I can recognize only the post-Constantine period for the extant writing; the other results are questionable or untenable. In this I agree with Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1871, pp. 607 sqq. According to Lipsius (who here has accepted in its main points Scholten's criticism against Tisch.), the *Acta Pilati* were not known to Justin, Tertull., Eusebius. The first were the heathen Acts (Eus. 9, 5, 7), composed after A.D. 311 (according to Scholten, under the emperor Maximus (!) A.D. 307—313; more correctly, against Hilg., between autumn A.D. 311 and spring A.D. 312, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 220). The Christian Acts were thereby called forth, and they appeared first under Julian, A.D. 361—363 (above, I. p. 46). This view is without any organic cohesion; Pilate was certainly first an industriously elaborated Christian figure (as Lipsius, p. 17, himself admits a successively re-shaped Pilate report), but it is impossible that the triple appeal of Justin to these Acts should have been made "mythically" (Scholten) to what did not exist (thus also Hilg.). In particular Justin, *Ap.* 1, 35, 38, *Trypho*, 108 (comp. below, p. 116, n. 1), harmonize with *Acta Pil.* B. 10; Tert. *Ap.* 21 (*deliquium solis*) with *Acta Pil.* A. and B. 11 (see below). Moreover, Eus. 2, 2, is dependent not merely upon Tert.

² Chap. 1.

³ Chaps. 2, 4, 8.

in the synagogue he endeavours to restrain the elders and the people, who nevertheless gnash their teeth, whilst the adherents of Jesus shed their tears under the eyes of Pilate.¹ But Jesus has still more powerful helpers. When Jesus is led in, the Roman standards bow to him, and when they are transferred from the hands of the Hellenes to those of twelve stalwart Jews, they bow to him again. But not only the heathen standards, the heathen men also, Pilate and his constable or courier who fetches Jesus, pay homage to the Son of God.² The long-since begun christianizing of Pilate is here completed. He scarcely needs the encouragement of his wife Procla, a Jewess, against whom the Jews object that Jesus has caused her to dream by a sleeping potion.³ Pilate himself, at the very beginning, says of the works of healing wrought by Jesus: "He has been able to do this only by Æsculapius;" and immediately thereupon he is afraid as governor to bring the king before his tribunal. The courier must bring in Jesus with profound respect, with bowings, with lordly titles, and amid the spreading out of garments and head-bands upon the floor.⁴ Pilate loudly affirms by the sun, by the genius of the emperor, that he cannot shed innocent blood. He charges the Jews with having been continually seditious, and always unfaithful to their benefactors, to God and to Moses.⁵ Therefore Jesus honours him with a communication concerning the dispensation of God, the predictions of his death and resurrection in the Old Testament.⁶ Even the shadows which John had left upon Pilate are taken away. Pilate does not deny the truth, he only asks whether there is any truth upon earth.⁷ He is not guilty of insisting upon supreme authority; the disas-

¹ Chaps. 2, 4—9. On Veronica, see below, p. 130, n. 2.

² Chap. 1.

³ Chap. 2. *Pröcla* (above, pp. 100 sq.) in A, poorly attested; on the other hand, B, chap. 4, comp. Lipsius, p. 38.

⁴ Chap. 1. *Καθάπλωμα* A, *μανῆύλιον* B (mantle). A, B, *φακῳλίον*, Lat. *fasciola* (head-band). Scholten, p. 174; Lipsius, p. 34. According to B, the mantle of Pilate himself was spread out.

⁵ Chaps. 2, 3, 9.

⁶ Chaps. 3, 4.

⁷ Chap. 3.

trous power is given to the Jews; Pilate is compelled to act in accordance with the Scriptures.¹ Nothing is wanting but that Pilate should crucify Jesus avowedly in obedience to the will of God and the Scriptures. And the author has refrained from going thus far probably only because he could not convert everything into fable, and because he wished to adhere to the narrative of the fourth Gospel. For the crisis is at last essentially the same. The cry is addressed to Pilate: "The emperor is our king, not he. It is true the magi paid him homage, but Herod wished to kill him; then he fled with his father!" At this fact Pilate is startled: "Is he the one whom Herod sought?" He washes his hands, causes the *velum*, the curtain of the tribunal, to be drawn, and condemns Jesus.² Here we see the course of thought of the later Gospels come to a standstill. But the dark fact remained, and even Pilate had, by his right feeling and feeble will, delayed it only a moment.

¹ Chaps. 3, 4.

² Chap. 9. Βῆλον, Lips. p. 40.

DIVISION II.—THE DEATH ON THE CROSS.

THE impossible, which the accusation against Jesus darkly shadowed forth, seemed by the double procedure before the Sanhedrim and before Pilate to be dissipated or at least to be deferred; yet, doubtful whether we wake or dream, we strangely find ourselves at the point where the most appalling occurrence which the history of the world has ever witnessed began, with the calm step of ordinary events, to be consummated under God's heaven. To the Gentiles who led Jesus to death, the circumstance was but an ordinary one; to the leaders of the Jews who on the high feast of Easter delivered him to the shambles, it was a festival of God and of men. But God was silent: mourning, or assenting—and wherefore assenting? We can only guess.

A.—THE WAY TO DEATH.

1.—*The Way to the Cross.*

When Pilate had pronounced the sentence of death which had been demanded by the Jews, he proceeded at once, according to Roman custom, to carry it into effect, but in doing this he did not give up the prisoner to the Jews. For the execution of the sentence belonged to the judge, and primarily to the Romans, as the fourth Gospel was well aware; and it was quite an exceptional case in which, under the emperor Claudius, a tribune Celer was delivered up to the Jews, as an enemy of theirs, to suffer death at their hands.¹ It is true that Luke and John,

¹ Immediate execution, Geib, *l. c.* p. 150. Therefore *rapere ad supplicium, crucem*, Cic. *Orat.* 2, 59. Comp. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 52. *B. J.* 2, 14, 9. Also among the Jews,

passing by the cautious language of Matthew and Mark, make it appear as if Jesus were given up "to the Jews;" and from this, as well as from general antipathy to the Jews, the narrative in the second revision of the Acts of Pilate was made to represent the Jews as the actual executioners, as those who led Jesus away, maltreated him, and erected the cross.¹

Pilate in person commanded the scourging, as is shown by Matthew and Mark; Luke and John knowing nothing of this scourging, they having unhistorically introduced the idea of scourging or its infliction long before as one of the means adopted by Pilate to save Jesus.² "Go, lictor, bind his hands; he shall be scourged with rods!" The carrying out of the sentence was usually introduced by some such command to inflict the cruel prelude, "the terrible preface" to the execution, particularly to crucifixion.³ The Roman citizen had long been happily freed, by several laws, from

Num. xv. 32 sqq.; Acts vii. 58; Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 4; *Ant.* 20, 9, 1. See Winer, *Lebenstrafen*. The judge also executes the sentence, Geib, pp. 149, 383, 671. John xviii. 31. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 7: *παραδοθῆναι Ἰουδαίους πρὸς αἰκίας*. Limited, Jos. *Ant.* 20, 6, 3.

¹ Luke xxiii. 25; John xix. 16. On the other hand, however, John xix. 19, 22 sq., 31 sqq. Also in Acts iii. 15, the cautious expression of Acts ii. 23, *διὰ χεῖρὸς ἀνόμων ἀνέλατε*, is passed over for the sake of brevity. Similarly the Jews, in Justin, *Trypho*, 108: *ἡμῶν σταυρωσάντων*. Comp. *Apol.* 1, 35. *Acta Pil.* B. 10. Yet, Steinm. p. 175! According to Steinm., it was the Jews who insultingly gave Jesus the two companions and set his cross in the middle! The mistake arose through a misunderstanding of Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15.

² See above, pp. 103, 108, 111. Friedl., p. 135, assenting to these accounts, thinks that the final scourging was omitted, in consideration of the previous infliction. The subject was thus regarded by Hug, *Zeitschrift*, 1830, 5, pp. 5 sqq.; afterwards Tholuck, *Glaubw.* p. 363, and others, held the scourging of Jesus to be part of the inquisition, to be a kind of torture. Comp. Tac. *Hist.* 4, 27; Seneca, *Ir.* 3, 18; Acts xxii. 24. There can, however, be no doubt as to the truth, since the aim of Luke and John is clear, and scourging before crucifixion was (against Paulus, p. 647) *quite usual*. Wetstein, p. 531. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 506. See also below. See simply Matt. xxvii. 26; Mark xv. 15.

³ I, lictor, conliga manus, Cic. *C. Rabb.* 4. Livy, 1, 26. Virgas expedire jubet, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62. Jerome on Matt. xxvii.: sciendum est, Pil. Romanis legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum erat, ut qui crucifigeretur, prius flagellis verberetur. Comp. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 54. Livy, 7, 19; 10, 9; 33, 36. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 14, 9; 5, 11, 1. Dio C. 49, 22. Just. *Hist.* 21, 4. Preface, Hug; *Freib. Zeitschr.* 1830, 5, p. 2. Jos. *B. J.* 2, 14, 9 (his): *προακισμὸς* (preparatory maltreatment). Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6: *media mors, med. supplicium*.

this painful and shameful punishment, employed sometimes as a means of examination, sometimes as a milder expiation, and sometimes as a prelude to capital punishment. But it was still practised in the provinces, and by many governors it was with despotic cruelty inflicted even upon Roman citizens, in Judæa under Florus upon Roman knights, in spite of the protestation, "I am a Roman citizen."¹ The delinquent was seized by the experienced assistants of the authority—whose number might range from two up to six—was stripped, bound in a stooping attitude, with his hands behind him, to a stake or a low column near the judgment-seat or at the place of execution, and then from all sides he was beaten with thin elm rods, the strokes of which fell with a loud noise. Slaves and provincials were, as a rule, scourged yet more severely with whips, cords or straps, on the ends of which were often fastened acorn-shaped leaden balls or sharp-pointed bones.² It frequently happened that not only was the back belaboured and lacerated, but even the eyes, face and breast were wounded, and the teeth were knocked out.³ The

¹ Lex Valeria, particularly Porcia, Sempronia, Livy, 10, 9. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 63; *C. Rab.* 4. Gell. 10, 3. *Dig.* 48, 19, 10. Friedl. p. 114. Langen, pp. 278 sqq. Flagella questionis causa (quæst. p. torm), Seneca, *Ir.* 3, 18; and above, p. 116, n. 2. Milder punishment, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62. Verres flogged and crucified, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6, 44, 53 sq. *Civ. Rom. ib.* 5, 62. Florus in Judæa whipped Roman knights, *Jos. B.J.* 2, 14, 9. Comp. Seneca, *l.c.* Mildness of Rome! Cic. *Verr.* 5, 44; *C. Rab.* 3.

² Lipsius, *De Cruce*, I. p. 3. Friedl. pp. 114 sqq. Langen, pp. 281 sqq. Two assistants, *Apul. Met.* 3, Bip. p. 48; six, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 54. *ib.*: exercitatissimi lictores. Stripping, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62; Gell. 10, 3; *Suet. Cal.* 26; *Tac. Hist.* 4, 27; Philo, *Flacc.* p. 976; Acts xvi. 22. Ἰπὸ βήματος, *Jos. B.J.* 2, 14, 9. In medio foro, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62. Σταυρῷ προσδήσας, Dio C. 49, 22. Palus destitutus in foro, Gell. 10, 3. Ad palum alligatus, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6. Adstringite ad columnam fortiter, *Plaut. Bacch.* 4, 7, 24. Post terga vinetis manibus, *Amm.* 19, 9, 1; comp. *Eus.* 4, 15. Strepitus plagarum, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62; *Livy*, 26, 16. Undique verberari, *Verr. l.c.* Μυρίας πληγὰς καθ' ὅλου τ. σώματος, *Eus. Mart. Pal.* 4. Ictibus plumbatarum (glandium) cæsi, IV. *Coron.* in *Büdingen, Röm. Kais.* III. p. 337; comp. *Codex Theod.* 9, 31, 1. Pointed reeds, *Eus.* 6, 41. Virgæ, flagella, Cic. *C. Rab.* 4. Flagella servis, *Mac. in Dig.* 48, 19, 10; *Ulp. in Dig.* 47, 10, 9, &c. Comp. *Eus.* 8, 10. Flagellum horrib., *Horace, Sat.* 1, 3, 119. The Gospels, Acts, and Josephus, everywhere show the whip (flagellum, μάστιξ).

³ *Juv.* 6, 478: hic frangit ferulas (also *Pliny, Hist. Nat.* 11, 49, 110), rubet ille flagello. *Horace, Ep.* 1, 16, 47: loris non nreris. *Just.* 21, 4: corpus verberibus lacerum in cruce figitur. *Eus.* 4, 23: entrails and veins visible. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 54: eyes, face. Also *Eus.* 6, 41 sq.; 8, 6; *Mart. Pal.* 4, 5.

powerful torturers were often stimulated and urged on by the judge, and under the force of their blows many a victim, after loud lamentations and spasmodic convulsions, swooned away. Many died, and many, unrecognizable masses of flesh, were carried away as dead, only afterwards to find in actual death relief from swellings and fevers, from infirmity and shame.¹ The scourging of Jesus took place before the judgment-seat. It was certainly severe, because the military servants—the representatives of the lictors who were lacking to the procurator, and who besides were not employed except at the execution of Roman citizens—gladly gave vent to their repugnance to the Jews, and in this case to the King of the Jews; and also because the crucifixion, which involved some delay and had to be carried out at another place, relieved them from the necessity of sparing time and strength and fury.² Yet the Gospels, hurrying from the bad to the worst, have mentioned this torture of Jesus in only a few words. The Acts of Pilate, confounding the Roman with the Jewish scourging, speak of forty stripes with a stick. John has sought to exhibit to our eyes and feelings the picture of Jesus's torture; and the later Church, since the fourth century, has rejoiced to lay its hand upon the spurious remains of the pillar which witnessed the humiliation of the Son of Man for the sake of men.³ But even here we must not exaggerate; the mocking of Jesus which followed forbids us—if we would

¹ Livy, 26, 16: adde virgas! Suet. *Cal.* 26: firme. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 54: ad tribunal ante pedes tuos ad terram virgis et verber. abjectum. Death, illness, *ib.* Philo. *Flacc.* p. 976. Gell. 10, 3. Cic. *Verr.* 3, 29: virgis ad necem cæsi. *Ib.* 4, 39: moriere virgis. *Verr.* 5, 54: pro mortuo sublatus; brevi postea mortuus. Convulsions, horrible dancing of one who was whipped out (στροφαι παντοδαπαί, κινήσεις ἀτερπείς, κακός ὀρχηστῆς), Plut. *Coriol.* 24. IV. *Coron. l.c.*: emiscrunt spiritum. Similarly Ter. *Adelph.* 2, 1, 28. Suet. *Ner.* 49.

² Therefore as under Florus, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 14, 9. Lictors, see Friedl. p. 115. Geib, pp. 150, 384. Pauly, *R. W. Lictor*. During the time of the emperors, the soldiers performed the service of carnifex, Geib, p. 671. Comp. Suet. *Cal.* 26, 32: miles decollandi artifex. In Josephus, and during the persecutions of the Christians, the soldiers almost always appear. Eus. 6, 5, 41; Jos. *B. J.* 5, 11, 1.

³ *Acta Pil.* B. 9. John xix. 1, 5. The relics in *Itin. Burdig.* ed. Wesseling, p. 590; in Jerome, Prud., Greg. of Tours; Friedl. p. 115; Langen, p. 284.

not suppose the soldiers to be wild beasts—to think of an extreme degree of previous maltreatment and gross injury.

Before the execution took place, there was a pause to allow the necessary commands to be given, the guards with their instruments and provisions to be called out, and the cross to be prepared in the proper manner.¹ It was perhaps an act of compassion on the part of Pilate that he did not make the scourged prisoner wait outside, but had him taken inside the palace, in a guard-room of the soldiers.² But whilst Pilate himself withdrew from the proceedings into his private apartments, his rough and—as ever—Jew-hating Roman or Syrian soldiery, contrary, as Origen noted, to all the rules of discipline, derived as much amusement as they could from the last leisure moments of the poor and now outlawed prisoner, whose powers of physical resistance had warded off the first attack of death.³ When they were re-clothing him, they jestingly threw round him, instead of the Israelitish outer garment, a small circular scarlet woollen Roman military cloak, and fastened it with a buckle upon his right shoulder.⁴ The *sagum* or *paludamentum* was also worn by Roman generals and *imperatores*, and was conferred as an honour upon

¹ Collecting the guards, Matt. xxvii. 27. Provisions (cœnula), Petron. *Sat.* 111 sq. Spart. *Hudr.* 10 (comp. below). Cross, *Acta Pil.* c. 10 : κατασκευάσ. τ. σταυρόν. (comp. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 62 : crux comparatur during the scourging). Lucian, *Judic. Vocal.* 12 : ξύλα τεκταίνειν, δημιουργεῖν. Artem. *On.* 2, 53 : ἐκ ξύλων κ. ἡλων γέγονε.

² Matt. xxvii. 27. The word *Prætorium* might, in itself, signify any space within the walls of the castle. But the locality of the tribunal (see above) decides for the house.

³ The troops of the provinces (comp. Vulc. Gall. *Avid. Cass.* 5) predominantly provincials; in Judæa mostly not Jews, see above, I. p. 267, III. p. 218; comp. Renan, 15th ed. p. 405. Yet comp. below. Hostile to the Jews, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 1 sq.; 5, 11, 1; *Ant.* 19, 9, 1. Scoffing on the way to and during execution usual, Jos. *B. J.* 5, 11, 1 (χλεύη); Plaut. *Most.* 1, 1, 2; Dion. II. 7, 69; Eus. 6, 5, 41. Origen upon Matt., 125, ascribes the behaviour of the soldiers partly to the novelty of their *imperium*, partly to the devil.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 28; Mark xv. 17; John xix. 2, comp. Luke xxiii. 11. Matt. (according to Sin., differently in Vat.) speaks of stripping, Mark only of clothing; the latter is the more probable. Both afterwards mention the putting on of his own clothes. The *sagum*, *sagulum*, Friell. p. 118. *Chlamys coccinea*, Lampsid. *A. Scr.* 40. Matt. correctly: scarlet; Mark and John: purple. Frequent confounding of the colours, Wetst. p. 533. See also above, p. 104, n. 1.

foreign kings; but in these cases it was larger and of better material and colour, and furnished with a golden buckle.¹ Thus Jesus was made to represent such an *imperator* in the *sagum*, according to Mark and John a king in purple. The details of the trial, the accusation of the Jews, the question of Pilate, were jestingly repeated, and such resources made use of as were at hand. Here one would bring a reed, probably the *Donax* reed, to serve as a sceptre; there one would hastily pluck an armful of prickly plants from the walls of the court or from Herod's gardens, and weave them into what Pliny calls the vilest of wreaths, to serve as a royal diadem instead of crown or laurels.² This was all done in a moment, for mockery is the quickest workman: the reed was in Jesus's right hand, the crown pressed upon his head, and his subjects were paying him homage by prostrating themselves and crying, "Hail! O King of the Jews!"³ According to Justin's tradition, they even placed him upon the tribunal and went through the forms of trial before him.⁴ Then, as if too much honour had been done him, the jesting was followed closely by the letting loose of brutal passion. They spat in his face, snatched the sceptre out of his hand, and—to complete the scourging—smote him upon the head.⁵ This scene exhibits a remarkable similarity to the derision with which, a

¹ Gift by the Romans to Massinissa, Livy, 30, 17. Comp. Tac. *Ann.* 12, 56.

² Reed (*Arundo donax*, Linn.), Friedl. p. 119. Different surmises as to *acantha*, *ib.*, and Arnold, *R. E.* XI. p. 25. According to legends, the *nubb* tree, *lotos*, *dhom* apple with ivy-like leaves. Sieber suggests the *Lycium spinosum* (the *shankun* of the Arabs), which is common at Jerusalem, and has prickly, hard and tough twigs. Comp. Langen, p. 285. The *Acanthus*, bear's-claw, mentioned by Mich., is to be rejected, because *ἄκανθα* (not = *oc*) and *ἀκάνθινος* (Mark xv. 17) never stand with that signification (see Grimm and Meyer). Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 21, 10: *vilissima* (corona) *spineola* (a kind of briar).

³ Comp.: Have Caesar, Auguste, *χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς*, Mart. *Ep.* 14, 71, 2; Vopise. *Procul.* 13; Macrob. *Sat.* 2, 4. Wetstein, p. 534 (in drama). Friedl. p. 117. Abulfeda, *Ann. Mosl.* II. p. 184, in Tholuck, p. 364.

⁴ Justin, *Ap.* 1, 35 (Jews). Lipsius thinks (p. 15) that Justin borrowed it simply from Is. lviii. 2! No, from the *Actu Pil.*, to which, as well as to Isaiah, he appeals, and which still shows in B. 10 a parallel case of Jewish maltreatment.

⁵ Cic. *Verr.* 5, 51: *lictor converso bacillo oculos misero tundere vehementiss. cepit. Itaque illi cum sanguis os oculosque complexset, concidit.*

few years later, in the summer of A.D. 38, the people of Alexandria greeted an actual king of the Jews, the newly-created—by the grace of Caligula—yet haughty Agrippa I., the former controller of the market at Tiberias, and the Galilean neighbour of Jesus. They caught a fool named Carabas, a man well known in the city, and who was entirely devoid of any sense for clothing, exhibited him in an elevated position in the gymnasium, wrapped him in a carpet, placed a paper crown upon his head, gave him a reed sceptre in his hand and three attendants with staves by his side. They then tried to outdo one another in the zeal with which they greeted him or appealed to him for judgment, in the Aramaic language of the Jews: “Mari, Lord, Lord!”¹ The only difference was, that Agrippa, the royal comedian, was derided at a distance, and that even the city-fool Carabas was not maltreated,—while Jesus! The historical character of the proceeding in Pilate’s palace is beyond question, even if no adherent of Jesus could see within the palace, and though the silence of Luke and John, taken in connection with the great similarity of the historical buffoonry at Alexandria, might suggest a surmise that the history of the passion has been amplified and coloured by artificial but kindred details. Luke and John have, in fact, the same incident, but at the wrong place, and in an incorrect form—in the middle of the trial. The similarity of the proceedings at Alexandria and elsewhere (*e.g.* the derision of the dishonoured prophet by the Sanhedrists, early in the morning) only proves the very conceivable frequency of such exhibitions of popular humour. And, finally, the news of this genuine soldier’s frolic would rapidly reach the ears of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, perhaps through the loquacity of the heroes of it themselves.² An evidence of its genuineness lies

¹ See, besides above, II. p. 394, my article *Herodier*, in *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 51 (after Philo, *Flacc.* p. 980). Also quoted in Wetst. p. 533; Friedl. p. 117. Similar also in Vop. *Proc.* 13. *Μάρτυς* (τ. *κέρτιον*), in Philo, is derived from *mare(i)*, *dominus*, Bux. p. 1246. Our Lord would be *marana*, or (from *maran*) *maranan*.

² Comp. the coarse humour of the soldiery at the death of Agrippa I., *Jos. Ant.* 19, 9, 1; under the procurator Cumanus, *B. J.* 2, 12, 1.

also in the confinement of the regal comedy to the interior of the palace. It is expressly narrated that Jesus was dressed in his own clothes before he was taken forth to be crucified.¹ This was in harmony with Roman dignity and circumspection, for derision of Judaism in public was strictly forbidden to the Roman soldiers under penalty of death.²

The stern and solemn close began. It was 9 a.m., about an hour after the sentence had been pronounced.³ The arrangements

¹ Matt. xxvii. 31.

² Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 1.

³ Comp. Mark xv. 25. On the other hand, John (like John, Val. ap. Ir. 1, 14, 6; *Acta Pil.* B. 10, &c.) has, in xix. 14, postponed the sentence of Pilate until about noon. On the numerous arbitrary attempts to reconcile Mark and John, comp.—besides the commentators—especially Langen, pp. 329 sqq. We pass over in silence most of these quite untenable hypotheses, among the most untenable of which are that of Gumpach (Casp. p. 193) and Hofm. (Meyer, p. 537), and that of Hesych. and Vict. of Capua, who exactly transpose (Langen, p. 331) the assertions of Mark and John (also Bunsen, p. 412: Mark gives only the time of the scourging), and mention but two. (1) *Correction of the text*: (a) assumption of clerical error in John, an easily possible transformation of a gamma (numeral 3) into a sigma (numeral 6), Eus., Ammon. *Chron. A.* (ιδίχειρον Ιω.), Theoph., Codd. D, L, St. Gall; comp. also Beng., Griesb., Friedl. (b) Clerical error in Mark, thus for the same reason Jerome (and a few transl.), recently also Casp. p. 195. (2) *Roman reckoning in Mark* (third hour=3 p.m., Paulus, III. p. 811), or better in *John*: sixth hour=6 a.m., Rettig, Tholuck, Olsh., Hug, Ewald, Wieseler, Isenberg, to some extent Langen. Partly admitted by Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 533. Then it is assumed that the judgment of Pilate began about 6 a.m., and that the execution took place about 9 a.m. Ewald still more definitely (p. 573): an hour before sunrise (Wieseler, *Beitr.* p. 252: 3—6 a.m.) Pilate began, an hour or an hour and a half later he pronounced sentence (on the other hand, Casp., p. 195, now asserts that the procedure in the praetorium lasted from 6 a.m. till noon!). Again as much time before the sentence was put into execution. Others, while they allow the difference between Mark and John to remain (Hase, Meyer, Baumlein, Lange, Press.), are influenced by their partiality for John to decide for him here (Hase, Meyer), so that factually they agree with Casp. What is correct in this question is easily found. The Roman reckoning of the hours in John is arbitrary, and in this place both ludicrous and useless. In illustration of the first charge, in all the passages in John the Jewish reckoning can conveniently be assumed (above, III. p. 220), and in i. 39 (against Rettig), iv. 6, xi. 9, it is even required; whilst, on the other hand, even Wieseler both formerly (*Syn.* p. 410, comp. also Krabbe, p. 503) and now (*Beitr.* p. 252) must make wretched exceptions, explaining at least xi. 9 as referring to the Jewish day, iv. 6 as referring to evening instead of morning. As to the second charge. If, according to the distinct assertion in John xix. 14, Pilate pronounced the sentence at the sixth hour, after a *long* inquiry, then this cannot reasonably have been 6 a.m., and the *beginning* of the inquiry, *πρωι* (xviii. 28) cannot reasonably have been (above, p. 79, n. 1) before sunrise, a few hours before 6 a.m.! But sunrise is useless, because even thus there remains a difference of three hours between Mark (the ninth hour) and John (the sixth hour). Finally, the time given by Mark agrees exactly with

were made, the whole of the guards of the palace, a cohort of at least five hundred men, perhaps the body-guard that Pilate had brought with him from Cæsarea, were called forth and drawn up in the palace-yard in order to preserve order; and a division, a manipule or a century, 120 or at least 60 men under the command of a captain, the usual *exactor* or executive-commandant, was given as escort to the procession on their way to the place of execution.¹ As there was some appearance of a revolutionary

the most ancient determinations as to the time of the morning administration of justice, which moreover contain within themselves proofs of probability. It also agrees with the well-known promptitude of the Roman administration of justice, particularly in the provinces. Mark cannot be accused of a symbolizing purpose, since the morning sacrifice in the temple (see above, p. 63) took place earlier. On the other hand, in John—as Börger (Langen, p. 331) and Weisse, then Baur and the critical school, saw—there comes into notice for noon the Passover-lamb custom, which indeed dominates the whole of his representation (above, V. pp. 301, 343). It is altogether a mistake for Meyer still to endeavour to retain an attitude of satirical opposition to these views.

¹ Matt. xxvii. 27 and Mark xv. 16 speak of an assembling of the whole *σπεῖρα* by the soldiers of the governor, after the scourging was over. It is usual to apply this to the Roman cohort (generally *σπεῖρα*; *τάξις*, Jos. *Ant.* 20, 5, 3; *τάγμα*, *B. J.* 5, 5, 8), which was as a rule posted at Jerusalem as a garrison, under the command of a tribunes and several centuriones (Acts xxi. 32), Acts xxiii. 23; *B. J.* 2, 12, 1; 2, 13, 5; 2, 15, 3 and 6; 5, 5, 8; *Ant.* 20, 5, 3; 20, 8, 11; comp. also under Hadrian, Sulph. Sev. 2, 31. At the same time it is assumed that the expression “whole cohort” is hyperbolical (Bleek, Langen, Meyer), since of course a number of guards would be required for service, particularly during the feast, in the fortress Antonia, in the towers, at the gates, in the temple, without reckoning the palace. But all this erroneous. For the Gospels speak with the greatest definiteness (1) of the assembling of the whole *σπεῖρα*, (2) of their being assembled within the prætorium, by no means of a calling of them from the barracks in Antonia, and accordingly *ἡ σπεῖρα* is not the well-known cohort that garrisoned Jerusalem (Meyer), but the (well-known) body of troops present in the prætorium. The “well-known garrison cohort” is the less to be thought of because it was only guard service in the temple that required a cohort (Jos. *B. J.* 2, 12, 1; *Ant.* 20, 5, 3), and because further the procurator was accustomed to bring other cohorts (two to the one already there, *B. J.* 2, 15, 3 and 6) with him from Cæsarea, and stationed a larger garrison (*τὸ πρὸς τοῖς βασιλείοις στρατόπεδον*) in and before his palace, the second main bulwark of the city, particularly if we reckon in the three strong northern towers, *B. J.* 2, 15, 5, comp. 2, 14, 9. This garrison would consist of the Cæsarean cohorts or of one of them, composed of Syrians (above, I. p. 267) or Italians (Acts x. 1, xxvii. 1), and was a kind of body-guard (comp. Matt. xxvii. 27, and Langen, p. 285). The New Testament and Josephus scarcely allow us to think of a manipulus (which *σπεῖρα* can however signify, Polyb. 11, 23, 1). On the other hand, it is scarcely probable that a whole cohort went to the place of execution, and the captain (Matt. xxvii. 54, comp. Acts xxi. 32) points rather (notwithstanding *B. J.* 2, 15, 3: *σπερῶν ἑκατοντάρχαι*) to a manipule or a century. Comp. Seneca, *De Ir.* 1, 16: cen-

movement among the people, Pilate would wish to be prepared for whatever might transpire.

We will first look for Jesus. He stood here in his ordinary dress, and held in his hands—perhaps with his arms bound to it by cords—the cross which, according to the cruel custom well known to him and introduced by the then lords of the country, he had himself to carry to the place of execution.¹ An ancient Roman custom condemned guilty slaves to be led through the streets with the neck fastened in a V-shaped wooden fork, originally the support of the chariot pole, and then to be whipped to death with rods or to be dragged to the cross. As crucifixion became more customary, the acute-angled fork was replaced by the so-called *patibulum*, probably two long horizontal beams of wood, the ends of which could be brought together, and between which the head of the criminal was placed, and his hands stretched out and bound to the other ends. In this wretched plight, he was dragged forth to the place of execution, where with his *patibulum*, the transverse beam to the vertical part of the cross, he was hung up and fastened on with nails. We are unwilling to think that to the other sufferings of Jesus was added that of bearing the torturing disgrace of the neck-yoke, with his hands bound thereto. The narrators of this history have not yet thought of this; and happily there is still proof that that ancient form of punishment was no longer the invariable rule, and that Jesus, in particular—as his clothing and his subsequent exemp-

turio supplicio præpositus (also in the case of Polycarp, Eus. 4, 15); though in the case of persons of high position also tribuni, *χιλίαρχοι*, Tac. *Ann.* 3, 14. Reckoning a legion as 4000—6000 men, there would be in a cohort—the tenth of a legion—at least 420 (Vespasian, *B.J.* 3, 4, 2, some 1000, some 600). A maniple of velites, hastati, principes, 120 men; a century originally 100, then 60 men. Volkmar, p. 590, not at all clear.

¹ Matt. xxvii. 32, xvi. 24. Patibulum ferre, Plaut. ap. Non. Marc. 221. Plutarch, *De sera Nimi. vind.* 9: τῷ σώμ. τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος τ. κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ σταυρόν. Artemid. *Oneir.* 2, 56: ὁ μέλλων σταυρῷ προσηλοῦσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει. Charit. ed. Hercher, 72, 25: τ. σταυρὸν ἔφερε; 72, 28: τ. σταυρ. βαστάζων; 76, 11: σταυρ. ἐβάστασα. The cords, especially when the criminal carried only the transverse beam), Kipping, *De Cruc.* p. 61. Langen, p. 294. Also *Acta Pil.* B. 10, speaks of bound hands.

tion by means of a representative show—was laden with his cross, that is with the transverse beam of the cross only lying upon his arms.¹ But two other crosses stood near his. Pilate had insultingly given him—as in later times other governors gave to the Christians—two companions in his fate, and those not simply seditious men but robbers, sworn foes to human society, the old pest of the land down to the destruction of Jerusalem.² It was scarcely Jesus, but rather the Jews, whom Pilate thus maliciously intended to wound by this peculiar

¹ These questions have been only recently (yet see Justus Lipsius, *De Cruce*, III. 1595 sqq.; Wetst. p. 964; Paulus, *Handb.* p. 663) investigated by C. G. Gobet, *Mnemos. Bibl. Philol. Batav.* VIII. pp. 275 sqq., and Marquardt, *Röm. Privatalt. thümer*, I. pp. 192 sqq. The furca (ὑπὸν ξύλον ἀμάξης, Plut. *Coriol.* 24; *Quæst. Rom.* 70; Suet. *Nero*, 49: nudi hominis cervicem inseri furcæ. Cic. *Divin.* 1, 26, 55: servus furcam ferens ductus est. Comp. Livy, 1, 26; 2, 36; *Epit.* 55; Val. Max. 1, 7, 4. Patibulum (pateo), Plant. ap. Non. *Mac.* 221: pat. ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci. Licin. *Macer ib.*: deligati ad patibulos circumferuntur et cruci defiguntur. Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 2, 4, 7: dispessis manibus patibulum quom habebis. Sen. *ad Marc.* 20: alii brachia patibulo explicuerunt. Macrobi. *Sat.* 1, 10: patibulo constrictus. Even these passages do not determine (as Cobet, against Marq., sees) whether the criminal was always placed in the patib. or only bound to it; several include crucifixion. Moreover, it is always said: more majorum, Suet. *l. c.* &c. Finally, since Jesus remained clothed, and the patib. was taken from him and borne by another (Luke xxiii. 26), the neck-yoke is excluded. Hence already Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19; *Jud.* 13: humeris portavit, extulit.—Even the description of the patib. by Marquardt is rather an inference as to what was probable (the ὑπὸν ξύλον, Plut. and δίδυμον ξ. Suid. point primarily to the furca), and is derived from its similarity to and frequent confusion with the furca. But there is great weight in the certain establishment of the fact, already long since recognized (Kipping, Lips.), that the Romans distinguished between patibulum and crux, and that as a rule the criminal carried only the patibulum. Comp. Plaut. *l. c.* patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci. Also Lic. *Mac. l. c.* Firmic. *Mat. Astron.* 6, 31. Tac. *Ann.* 14, 33. Tert. *Ap.* 12. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 18 sq. *Jud.* 13 also distinguishes antenna (sail-yard) with its cornua (apices) from the crux as such, and from the statumen (post). Crux and σταυρός are properly only the upright post: crucem ponere, in crucem tollere, ἀναβαίνειν εἰς σταυρόν, ἀνασταυροῦν (good Greek instead of the later σταυροῦν) (see below). In Latin never ferre crucem, except in the Italia that imitates the Greek. Only in Greek, φέρειν σταυρόν, Plut., Artem., Charit. (see above), and New Testament.

² Luke xxiii. 32 sq.; Matt. xxvii. 38; Mark xv. 27; John xix. 18. Hardly a mere invention (Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 520; Volkmar, p. 593, asserts only the possibility) based upon Is. liii. 12, comp. Mark xv. 27 (28); Luke xxii. 37. I believe that, had the incident not been a reality, the Evangelists' regard for the dignity of Jesus would have been stronger than their interest in the fulfilment of Old Testament passages. It must be remembered also that the prisoners were kept until the feast. Noack, p. 248, thinks of Samaritan ringleaders! "Ἀπὸ κακοῦργοις (in the Diocletian persecution). *Ens. Mart. Pal.* 6. Sixteen criminals chained together, Charit. 72, 25.

juxtaposition of criminals, whom at least he did not fetter together. But the recklessness with which he, merely with the view of emptying the prison and of finishing at one stroke his usual sanguinary Easter duty, arranged this group of offenders against the order of the country, is a strong proof of the superficial character of the impression which had been made upon him by Jesus. It also exhibits his complete personal indifference with respect to this condemnation, more plainly, more ingenuously, and more certainly than the fourth Gospel exhibits the opposite. In the best sources nothing is said of many spectators or bystanders, although both Jews and Romans were fond of public sights. If there had been a large concourse, the soldiers, at least outside of the city, would not have thought themselves fortunate to meet a man whom they could employ as cross-bearer, and the mockery of the bystanders would have been recorded, rather than that of persons who afterwards passed by the cross.¹ This loneliness of the Lord at the close of his career, when the great precautionary military escort might well have been dispensed with, is sufficiently explained by the panic of alarm which had fallen upon his adherents, by the ignorance of a great part of Jerusalem concerning the trial, which had, as it were, grown out of the ground and been carried to a close in a few hours, and perhaps still more by the demands of the chief day of the feast, which imposed upon the conscientious (and on that day who was not conscientious?) rest, attendance at the temple, and sacrifice. Even the crowds of people that had supported the Sanhedrists may have returned back to these sacrifices: it was not the first time that ferocity and piety had shaken hands within the period of half an hour.²

¹ Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 24: προαχθείς ἔξω τ. πόλεως τοῦ πλήθους ἐπομένον. *Ant.* 20, 6, 3: πάντων ὁρώντων. Sen. *De Ir.* 1, 16: ingenti concursu deducuntur. *Just.* 22, 7: in max. concione populi. Hence the executions at the festival, see below.

² Attendance at the temple from midnight, see above, p. 3, n. 1. More especially from the next day, Num. xxviii. 17 sqq.; comp. Lightfoot, p. 500. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 145. *Θόουσι προθύμως*, *Ant.* 17, 9, 3; 3, 10, 5; *B.J.* 2, 1, 3; 6, 9, 3. Above, I. p. 254. Furrer, article *Golgotha*, in *Bib.-Lex.* II. 506, speaks extravagantly of an accompanying fanatical multitude!

Under the direction of the captain—whom ecclesiastical pictures represent as on horseback, and inventive tradition calls Longinus—and preceded by the herald proclaiming aloud the ground of condemnation, his oral report being visibly presented to the eyes of men on a white wooden tablet borne in advance, the procession to the cross took its way, notwithstanding the festival—nay, for the very purpose of producing a deterring impression—through the thronged streets, and then passed through the city gate.¹ It was customary, among both the Jews and the Romans, for executions to take place in some retired spot outside of the city; and exceptions were due only to the caprice and asperity of certain kings or governors, or to the fanaticism of revolutionary parties.² Alexander Jannæus had 800 Jews

¹ Comp. Langen, p. 353. On horseback, still in Merz and Pressensé. Longinus (Acta Pil.) from λόγχη, John xix. 34. According to Ewald, p. 581, from the consul for A.D. 30. Positively as Ewald rejects the former derivation, he does not explain how it was that the consul of the alleged Passion year, and in particular Cass. Longinus, and not his colleague Vicinius, was made to be the captain in Palestine; and still less does he perceive the origin of the tradition. "Longinus" means, in the ancient Acta Pil. (A. 16, 4; spurious, 10, 1), the soldier with the lance; in B. 11, 1, it first became the pars potior, the captain. Upon this tradition, comp. Scholt. p. 171; Lipsius, p. 38. The herald (per præconem pronuntiati, Curt. 4, 4; comp. Livy, 26, 15 sq.; Lamprid. A. Sev. 36, 51; Eus. 4, 15), Friedl. p. 128. Quite customary, especially among the Jews. *Sanh.* 6 hal 2: educunt ad lapid. et prævit præco sic clamans: prodit N. filius N. ad lapidat., quia talia commisit, etc. Testes in eum sunt N. et N. Quicunque pro eo defensionem proferre potest, prodeat et proferat. Lightfoot, pp. 56, 385. Also the well-known (above, I. p. 23) passage in the Bab. Gamara concerning Jesus, Lightfoot, p. 385. The white tablet (σάνις, λεύκωμα, πίναξ, αἰτία, titulus, Suet. *Cal.* 32; *Domit.* 10. Dio C. 54, 3 (μετὰ γραμμάτων τὴν αἰτίαν τ. θανατώσεως αὐτοῦ δηλοῦντων). Eus. 5, 1. *Evan. Nic.* A. 10. Socrates, 1, 17. Friedl. p. 128. Assiduous parading of all the streets among both Jews and Romans (ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν πᾶσαν σίρουντες), *Ant.* 20, 6, 3. Also *B. J.* 4, 6, 1: διὰ μέσης ἐσέρετο τ. πόλει. Among the Romans, the circumferre was an essential part of the punishment, especially of the furca punishment. See above, p. 125, n. 1. Comp. Dio C. 54, 3: διὰ τ. ἀγορᾶς μέσης διαγογόντες. Macrob. *Sat.* 1, 10: per circum agit. There might be room for question because of the Jewish festival, since the Romans also were scrupulous in such cases (Livy, 2, 36; Cic. *Div.* 1, 26, 55; Plut. *Cor.* 24); but what was the Jewish festival to them? And the Jews themselves demanded the publicity of the festivals for executions (see below).

² Cic. *Verr.* 5, 66: post urbem. Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 2, 4, 6: extra portem. Sen. *Ir.* 1, 16: extra vallum. Comp. Livy, 8, 15. Similarly among the Jews, Levit. xxiv. 14; Deut. xxii. 24; 1 Kings xxi. 13; Acts vii. 58; Hebr. xiii. 12. Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 24: ἔξω τ. πόλει, *B. J.* 4, 6, 1: ἔξω πολῶν. Talmud: locus lapidationis erat extra

crucified within the walls of Jerusalem; the prætor Verres crucified a Roman citizen on the space before the harbour at Messina; and the Zealots murdered Zachariah, the son of Baruch, in an inner space of the temple.¹ The cross seems, contrary to custom, to have been taken away from Jesus outside the gate. His being unused to such a burden and the maltreatment he had received perhaps made his pace slow and difficult, and the urging and pushing of the executioners were not able to quicken it. Without exactly sinking beneath his burden, as the later tradition asserts, Jesus would thus hinder the progress of the company or impede the measured march of the soldiers. But he had gone through what was most important, the exhibition in the city.² The sources do not allow us to think of compassion on the part of the captain; it was the soldiers—from whom Jesus certainly did not extort pity—that he incommoded.³ The fourth Gospel alone has felt compelled to repudiate the taking away of the cross; and we cannot directly say whether this has been done more with the view of removing the appearance of weakness in the man who was to bear the sins of the world in his cross, or to give the appearance of suffering to the uttermost. Perhaps also it was with a view to complete the resemblance to the offering up of Isaac; and most probably to dispose of the great Gnostic error that another suffered instead of Jesus. On the other hand, the Acts of Pilate take pains to employ the incident as a means of abstracting from the Jews a show of compassion,

urbem. *Gloss. in Bab. Sanh.* f. 42, 2; *Macc.* c. 3. Lightfoot, pp. 56, 385. Fr. p. 136. According to Volkmar, p. 592, only an Old Testament type!

¹ *Jos. B. J.* 1, 4, 6. *Cic. Verr.* 5, 66. Zealots, *B. J.* 4, 5, 4. On the other hand, Niger of Peræa was executed by them outside the gates, *B. J.* 4, 6, 1.

² *Matt.* xxvii. 31 sq.: ἐξέρχου. ἔθρον, comp. *Mark* xv. 20 sq.; *Luke* xxiii. 26 (inexact). The sinking under the load (against Langen, p. 295), essentially in *Acta Pil.* B. 10: ἦλθε μέχρι καὶ τῆς πύλης τ. πόλεως. Then: μὴ δυναμὶ περιπατεῖν, in consequence of the blows and the weight of the cross. According to Adrichomius, *Theatr. Terræ S.* 1590, § 118, Jesus fell after he had carried the cross eighty paces. Langen, *l. c.* Violence towards the victim, *Acts* vii. 58 (ἐκβαλόντες. *Jos. B. J.* 4, 6, 1; *Ant.* 20, 6, 3 (σώρειν). Comp. Philostratus, *Apoll.* 5, 24.

³ Elsewhere, compassion of the executioners is often mentioned, *Eus.* 6, 5; 6, 41. Comp. the captain and the corpse of Polycarp, *Eus.* 4, 15.

and of giving a fresh exhibition of their impatient bloodthirstiness.¹ The soldiers very opportunely met on the road a Hellenistic Jew, Simon of Cyrene in North Africa, whom the Church afterwards glorified, and whose sons were already reckoned by Mark as belonging to the Christian, and as it seems to the Roman, Church. With the characteristic military arrogance to which the provincials were only too often called upon to submit, particularly when the requisition was of a partially official nature, they stopped Simon and compelled him to bear the cross of Jesus.² In a strange manner ecclesiastical tradition has so blended the antagonistic reports as to make Jesus and Simon carry the cross together or alternately.³

¹ John xix. 17 (emphatic); already Origen upon Matt., 126, remarked the striking difference. Strauss, whilst he formerly (4th ed. II. p. 509) assumed that this was unknown to the author of the fourth Gospel, has since (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 367) quite correctly concluded that the omission is directed against the Basilidians (Iren. 1, 24, 4). Upon this I would remark, that since the publication of the first volume, I have—quite independently of this omission, and particularly on the ground of the First Epistle—come to recognize the general relation of the Gospel to the medium Gnosis, and especially to Basilidianism. Genesis xxii. 6 is already referred to by Tert. *Marc.* 3, 18; *Jud.* 13; and Lightfoot, p. 56 (comp. Rom. viii. 32). But see also John i. 29; Matt. xvi. 24; comp. Steinm. p. 170. *Acta Pil.* B. 10: ἐκ τ. ἐπιθυμίας στανρωσαι ὅσον τάχος, φονεῦσαι συντομώτερον. The exhaustion of Jesus does not prove that he had to bear not merely the transverse beam, but the whole cross (comp. Lipsius, *De Cruce*, II. p. 5, opp. Kipping, p. 62; Langen, p. 294). That Golgotha was not a usual place of crucifixion with a permanent post for the cross, proves nothing in favour of Jesus' bearing the whole cross.

² Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26. Luke and Mark give ἀπ' ἀγροῦ (usually incorrectly explained as referring to a field and agriculture, Matt. xxiv. 40; on the contrary, already Vulg. comp. Luke ix. 12; Mark vi. 56, xvi. 12, more correctly de villa); comp. also Lat., rure huc advenit. Ter. *Hec.* 1, 2, 115. Thus also Wieseler, *Beiträge*, p. 267. Mark picturesquely gives a παράγειν (comp. Matt. D, It. εἰς ἀπάντης αὐτοῦ). Compulsion expressed by ἀγγαρ. (Vulg. angariare), Matt., Mark. More fully treated above, III. p. 316. Luke: ἐπέθηκαν and ὀπίσω. Cyrene one-fourth Jewish, Jos. *Ant.* 14, 7, 2. Acts ii. 10; see Winer, and Friedl. p. 139. The ecclesiastical legend, above, I. p. 130. Langen, p. 298. Even according to Press., p. 624, Simon became a believer from that day. According to Volkmar, p. 592, he was perhaps only a Christian martyr; and, because of Heb. xiii. 12, a man from the country; let note be taken also of Acts xxi. 35!

³ Already Origen upon Matt., 126. Comp. Lips. *De Cruce*, II. p. 5. Langen, p. 298. From Paulus to Neander, Tholuck, Krabbe, Steinm., it has been assumed that John gives the beginning, the Synoptics what took place later,—a violence against John against which Fritzsche uttered a warning.

It was difficult for Christian sentiment to see the Saviour of the world taking his last steps thus forsaken, forgotten, and forlorn, in the midst of robbers and constables; hence sympathetic groups, representative of his dignity and of Christian sentiment, were very early introduced. Luke already tells of a great multitude of attendant people, especially of women, who bewailed and lamented him.¹ Later ecclesiastical tradition has given special prominence to Bernice or Veronica.² One sees with satisfaction the noble characters, in which is lacking neither the human on the day of misfortune, nor an appreciation of spiritual sublimity amid the foul aspersions of men. But the contrast is yet more astonishingly given: the object of pity shows himself the strong one by a last powerful utterance; nay, though the pity may affect him, he deprecates it, because Jerusalem, because even these weeping women owe pity to themselves in view of the anger of God that menaces them and their children in consequence of the murder of the Messiah. "If this is done in the green wood, what will be done in the dry?" If God allows the sound stem thus to perish, how will not the rotten tree burn in the fire? Though these words are in themselves historically worthy of the lips of Jesus—since in them he lifts himself as

¹ Luke xxiii. 27—31. Old Test., Hosea x. 8; comp. Rev. vi. 16; *Book of Enoch*, 3. Sepp, *L. J.* 2nd ed. VI. p. 321 (also Langen, p. 302), has not badly brought these women into connection with the generous persons who gave Jesus drink, Matt. xxvii. 34, &c. The passage from the Talmud has also been quoted: non planxerunt eductum ad supplicium, sed interius luxerunt in corde (according to the gloss, with the view of full expiation), *Bab. Sanh.* f. 42, 2. Lightfoot, pp. 56, 386. Lamentation suppressed by fear, *Ant.* 17, 9, 1; *B. J.* 4, 5, 3.

² The beginning of the myth of Veronica lies (against Scholten) in Clem. *Hom.*, where she is the daughter of Justa, the Canaanitish woman (Matt. xv.). Above, I. p. 35; IV. p. 166. Yet Eus., 7, 18, does not know the woman with the issue of blood under this name. In *Acta Pil.* 7 (better attested in B. than A.), she appears before Pilate as the woman who had been healed of the issue. In the *Mors Pilat.*, Tisch. p. 433, and in the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, *ib.* p. 459, she has the portrait of Jesus, which he (to keep him in her memory when he is absent on his journeys) impressed upon a linen cloth. According to the later ecclesiastical tradition (see the Bollandists), she dried Jesus' face with her handkerchief when he was going to the cross, and he left his Passion-picture on the cloth. Comp. Langen, p. 299; Zöckler, article *Veronica*, Herzog, XVII. p. 86. Scholten, *Aelt. Zeugn.* pp. 170 sqq. Lipsius, *Pilatusakten*, pp. 34 sq.

a hero, now greater than in Gethsemane, above and beyond his personal sufferings, to the standpoint of objectivity, of sympathy with his unhappy nation—yet they were not historically spoken. The other sources know nothing of female adherents and attendants at Jerusalem, nothing of any last witnesses. Though Jesus was not forbidden to speak, yet he, hitherto so reticent, certainly could not in his present condition have made such a long address, containing Biblical passages; and least of all could he have done it when only the moment before the cross was taken from him because he was exhausted. Moreover, the contents reveal the author who had put into the mouth of Jesus when entering the city the tearful words concerning Jerusalem. That which the entering Jesus had predicted, the departing, the dying Jesus is now made again to re-affirm in the face of the short-sighted benevolence of those womanly souls that erred and yet did not err as to the object of their tears. But the Old Testament is also fulfilled. The mourning for the “pierced” of the prophet Zechariah, the great lamentation as for an only-begotten made by the women of Israel, this prediction of the prophet must—a hopeful sign for a better future of Israel—be actually fulfilled by the women of Jerusalem.¹

Though Luke has introduced the women of Jerusalem, it certainly was more natural to speak of the women of Galilee; and of whom rather than of the mother of Jesus? Hence, according to the second recension of the Acts of Pilate, the procession was at first followed by John from among the disciples; John then hastened away and carried to the mother of Jesus the news both of the arrest and of the leading forth. With a loud outcry, Mary bewails the fate of the most innocent; she then,

¹ Strauss, 4th ed. II. j. 510, thinks of (besides Hosea) a borrowing from Luke xxi. 23; in his *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 368, he finds in this passage only the counterpart to Luke xix. 41 sqq. It is remarkable that no one has thought of Zech. xii. 10—14 (comp. also Luke xxiii. 48; Acts iii. 19). The Rabbis applied Song of Sol. iii. 10 to the Messiah, Wünsche, p. 90. Weisse also refuses to accept the women (below, p. 147, n. 5), II. p. 178. Steinm., p. 180, admits the passage. A man led out to death speaks, Jos. *B.J.* 4, 6, 1.

accompanied by the Galilean women and John, hastens weeping on the way to see her son. John points out to her how he walks along with fettered hands and with a crown of thorns upon his head. She falls swooning to the ground, and her companions stand round her weeping. Finally, she rises and cries aloud: "My Lord, my son, whither is the beauty of thy countenance fled? How can I endure to see thee suffer thus? Whither is gone all the good which thou hast done in Judæa? What evil hast thou done to the Jews?" Thus she cries, beating her breast, and tearing her face with her nails. The Jews force her from the way; yet she remains and cries: "Slay me first, ye unrighteous Jews!" Under the cross, until she is driven away, she continues to cry: "My son, my son! Bow down thyself, O cross, that I may embrace him!"¹

2.—*Golgotha*.

The goal was soon reached. Close upon the high road was a spot with a name that recalls the better-known Galil and Gilgal, viz. Golgothâ, properly Gûlgoltha, Greek *kranion*, i.e. skull, or, according to the Gospels, "The Place of the Skull," not exactly "The Place of Skulls."²

¹ *Acta Pil.* B. c. 10.

² Γολγοθᾶ, Matt., John; Γ— ἄν τόπον, Mark. Luke xxiii. 33 gives *only* the translation: τόπον καλοῦμ. κρανίον (Matt., Mark, John: κρανίου τόπος). The derivation from the Hebrew gû(u)lgolet, Aram. art. gûlgo(a)lta (Buxt. p. 440), comp. kappurta, zipporta, from kapporet, zipporet = skull (from galal, to roll) lies close at hand (comp. keseph hagûlgolet, that is, census capitis, Bux.); and in Cod. S. Gall. and Syr. Cod. Hier. in Matt. (similarly in John), the full golgoltha or gulgultha (elsewhere gogoltha) is retained. Beza has postulated this golgoltha (comp. Lightfoot, p. 386); the elision of the second l in the speech of the people is quite intelligible, especially in the case of an otherwise difficult word and a liquid (without recourse to Furrer's supposition, *Bib.-Lex.*, *Golgotha*, that it is a Grecized form), and Buxt., Gesen., Ewald, Arnold, have already pointed to the Syriac gagulta (where the first l is wanting), and the Arab dschaladschahun; Lightfoot, to the complete agreement of the Samaritan explanation with Num. i. 2 sqq. Gilgal (wheel, circle), Aram. and Greek Galgal, indeed Golgol, Eus. *Onom.* 143, 161. There is no longer any controversy upon it, and Kraft's derivation from gol goatha (Jer. xxxi. 39), alleged "Hill of dying" (*Topogr. Jerus.* p. 158), is, notwithstanding the assent of Ritter (XVI. i. p. 434; comp. also Casp. p. 196, and Renan, 15th ed. p. 429), quite given up. Arnold, *Herzog*,

It is a disputed question whether this name—which is nowhere else preserved—is to be referred to the appropriation of the spot as a place of execution and perhaps also of burial, or to the skull-shaped character of a bald, rocky eminence.¹ A third explanation, in one respect akin to the first, was that the spot was the place of Adam's sepulture. But this apparently profound invention of the ancient Church, which saw the tree of life growing above the grave of the first Adam through the death of the second Adam, can no longer be seriously entertained, although it has forced itself to some extent into the manuscripts.² Between the former explanations it is tolerably safe to decide. Against both there exists the objection that the ancient sources betray no knowledge either of the general use made of the spot or of its hilly nature; but the second possesses the advantage of being better supported by the language used and more intelligible. For one cannot understand how a place appropriated to executions, a place such as—according to Fallmerayer's just remark—has not existed and does not exist anywhere in the East, could have obtained the name of "Place of a Skull" or even of "The Skull." On the other hand, it is quite intelligible that the

V. p. 296. Remarkable is the corruption of Golgotha into Golgatha, as, contrary to all the ancient testimonies, and contrary to the Vulg., it is found in recent translations, as well as in Luther's, and now in Furrer's article. It is nevertheless possible, in relation to the Aram. (Bux. p. 440: gülgalta).—*Κρανίον* has nothing to do (against Paulus) with the cypress grove *Κράνειον* (from *κράνεια*, *κρανέα*, cornel cherry) at Corinth (Paus. 2, 2). Also here the Vulg.: *calvariæ locus* (*calva*, *calvaria*, the skull, comp. *κεφαλαί*, Strabo, 17, 3), and already Origen upon Matt. 126, *locus capitis*, are more exact than Luther with the "Place of Skulls," pointing to a collection of skulls.

¹ This question is really decided. Following the precedent of Cyril of Jerusalem, almost all moderns (as Ewald, Renan, Volkmar, comp. Meyer, *Komm.*) assume its derivation from the nature of the spot; the other view, held by Jerome (according to Volkmar, p. 591, perhaps by the Evangelists), is found in Luther (opp. Calov), and—which is remarkable—in Tholuck, Fritzsche, Friedl., and Strauss, also Grätz, p. 241, and Steinm., p. 169, who renders it "Place of Execution."

² Comp. Tert. against the Jews, 13; Origen on Matt. 126; Athanasius, Basil, Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, in Lightfoot, p. 761; Friedl. p. 140; Langen, p. 369; Tisch. on John xix.; also Meyer in comm. on Matt. Congruent, says Ambrose, *uti ibi vitæ nostræ primitiæ locarentur, ubi fuerant mortis exordia*. Augustine: *ibi erectus est medicus, ubi jacebat ægrotus*. Origen refers to 1 Cor. xix. 22.

voice of the people should here, as elsewhere—for instance, in the German designations, the words *Kopf*, *Kuppe*, *Grind*—have given a figurative name to a place; and that for executions a place should be chosen which by its elevation was distinctly marked off and was also visible at a distance, a place such as in more ancient times was in many instances dedicated to the Deity.¹ Especially was it a Roman custom to make the place of execution, with its horrors, obvious to the eyes of men.² Thus at the city of Messina the cross was usually set up in the street of Pompey; but this was not sufficient for the Roman prætor Verres, and he placed the cross under the eyes of both the citizens and the mariners in the Sicilian straits. Quinctilian expressly says: “Whenever we crucify criminals, the most frequented streets are chosen, where very many can see and be made to fear.”³

Such a spot was the Skull Hill or Skull Rock, which looked down upon the highway.⁴ If a more precise definition be required, the spot very probably lay on the south-west of the city, near the former Gennath Gate, the present Jaffa Gate. This was the nearest way out from the palace of Pilate, if a longer route through the city was not intentionally taken; but if, as is probable, such a route was taken, a spot in the neighbourhood of the castle garrison would still have been preferred for safety’s sake.⁵ This district lay, according to Jewish and Roman notions,

¹ Fallmerayer’s Memoir on Golgotha, in the *Abh. Bair. Akad.* 1852, VI. pp. 641 sqq. Also Arnold, *l. c.* pp. 309 sq. Among the Romans there was a *sceleratus campus*, Livy, 8, 15, Steinm., p. 169, very mistakenly thinks that a naming after the nature of the spot would be unpopular. As if there existed no Gabbata, Gamala, Kinneret, Sepphoris, Sichem, Ramat Lechi. Furrer also (*Bib.-Lex.* II. p. 506, against his *Wand.*) has recently endeavoured to remove the supposition of a hill, because there is none where he looks for G.; it is only a level, rocky ground in the form of a skull.

² Geib, p. 150; Friedl. p. 136; comp. Livy, 8, 15: *ad portam Collinam dextra via strata*. Also among the Carthaginians in *conspectu urbis*, Just. 18, 7; 21, 4; 22, 7. Among the Jews, 2 Sam. xxi. 9 (hill). Comp. above, p. 127, n. 2; and next note.

³ Cic. *Verr.* 5, 66. Quinct. *Decl.* 274. Pliny, *H. N.* 36, 24, 3: *spectanda civibus*. Jos. *B. J.* 5, 11, 1: τ. τείχους ἀντακρύ; 5, 6, 5: πρὸ τ. τείχους, εἰ τι πρὸς τ. ὕψιν ἰνδοῖεν καταπλαγῆντες.

⁴ Matt xxvii. 39 (they that passed by).

⁵ This readily-suggested view is not emphasized. The two Roman main defences were the castle of Herod with the towers in the west, and Antonia in the east. It

behind the city; and in close proximity to it, in the southern Valley of the Sons of Hinnom, where formerly children were sacrificed to Moloch, Jewish belief located the place of the dead, the entrance to hell. Moreover, the descent into the valley, which eastward from the upper city was abrupt, was less steep on the west, and might easily have presented a hilly contour in which the popular fancy saw a resemblance to a skull. This is certainly not the Golgotha which ecclesiastical tradition seeks at a distance from this spot, north-east of the upper city, and in the locality where at present, under the control and direction of the Turk and his soldiers, the Christian confessions with difficulty exercise a mutual forbearance at the sepulchre of their Lord, or more correctly in the motley crowd of their churches and chapels. Even among the learned, from the last century, when the German bookseller Korte ventured to introduce a vigorous renewal of the ancient doubt (1743), down to the most recent time, the controversy as to the genuineness of the site has been carried on with increasing bitterness, a controversy important to the Catholics, but of very subordinate interest to Protestants who do not preserve relics.¹ If we were to assent to the tradition, we should still have to regret the necessity of commemorating the death of Jesus at a spot which the superstition of Christians has done as much as the unbelief of heathenism to make unrecognizable. If a new Constantine were to build a still worthier memorial of the most indisputable authenticity, it would be impossible, after all the disturbances of the ages, to restore the ancient character of

is, however, conceivable that they remained in the neighbourhood of the castle, where the major part of the troops concerned was located, and where the procurator was. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 58; Mark xv. 43 sq.; John xix. 20.

¹ Comp. Friedl. pp. 136 sqq.; Langen's detailed *excursus* concerning Golg. pp. 363 sqq.; Winer, article *Golg.*; Robinson's *Palestine*; Tobler, *Golg.* 1851. Also Arnold's article, *Das h. Grab.*, in *Herzog*, V. p. 296, comp. XVIII. pp. 643 sqq., which embraces the whole of the modern literature upon the subject. Furrer, *Golg.* in Schenkel's *Bib.-Lex.* II. p. 506. The controversy would be most useless if, according to Volk. p. 591, the Gospels, which had only a general knowledge of the crucifixion, erroneously explained and adopted the spot Golgotha.

the district. But even the most exact restoration of the locality with which the death of Jesus was accidentally connected would be far less valuable than certainty concerning the region which he deliberately and lovingly chose to be the scene of his ministry, and which we have above endeavoured to find out.¹

Despite the number of learned vindications, the genuineness of the present site of Golgotha, or more correctly of the holy sepulchre—for this alone can claim ancient testimony—has been again and again disputed by such eminent investigators as Robinson, Wilson, Tobler, Van de Velde, Ewald, and Renan. These have not attached much value to the different tradition of the Acts of Pilate, which makes a forced reference to the Mount of Olives; but they have based their objection chiefly upon the ground that the present site, though according to Tobler in a rocky locality, lies within the city. It is held to be improbable either that the present small city should contain large spaces which were outside of the walls and of the inhabited portions of the ancient metropolis, or that the second of the ancient fortification walls of Jerusalem, outside of which the site of Golgotha must have been, should have been connected with the first and far-stretching southern walls in such an extremely unstrategic way as to sacrifice the commanding north-western heights by being carried far inwards to the east of the present holy sepulchre.² If we leave it to further researches among the remains of

¹ Furrer, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 493, article *Kapernaum*, has recently argued against Khan Minyeh and in favour of Telhum. But see above, III. p. 142.

² *Acta Pil.* A. 9: ἐν τῇ κήπῳ, ὅπου ἐπιάσθης. Comp. Gallic. Cass. 4. The neighbourhood of the Kidron a place of execution, 2 Kings xi. 15 sq.; Jos. *Ant.* 9, 7, 3. The Catholic tradition, against which even Krabbe, p. 498, is critical, has in a remarkable way found a new defender, not only in Caspari, pp. 196 sqq., but also in Furrer, *l.c.* p. 507 (as in the case of Gethsemane), who supports the traditional site because of the nature of the ground, because of the absence of layers of ruins in the west, as well as because of the city fortifications (narrow, rocky ridges, *perhaps* furnished with peculiar low knobs, and up to which the road south of the Church of the Sepulchre rises with a sharp ascent of 40—50 feet). As to the course of the wall (Jos. *B. J.* 5, 4, 2; 5, 6, 2), it can be made only probable that the second wall, which was not directly connected with the first (*B. J.* 5, 6, 2), began a little more to the eastward, but certainly not so far to the eastward as would be necessary for the above assumption.

the walls to establish Robinson's opinion, or on the other hand to verify the eastward bend of the second walls, the preponderance of probability lies in the meanwhile on the side of the former opinion; and we are led even beyond the boundary of probability by the incontrovertible statement of the Jewish historian, that the third city wall, which king Agrippa I. built about A.D. 42, only seven years after the death of Jesus, and which in its wide curve from south to north incontestably enclosed the mythical Golgotha, was for the purpose of bringing within the fortifications of the city the extensive and populous suburbs.¹ The evidence for the credibility of the ecclesiastical tradition, which tradition Langen would still favour and Furrer has recently undertaken to defend, is the more unsatisfactory because the fall of Jerusalem hid this site from the Christians; because the Christian zeal for relics did not begin until the third and fourth centuries; because the re-finding of the sepulchre and of the two famous nails of the cross, by the emperor Constantine or his mother Helena—who certainly permanently fixed the site, notwithstanding subsequent destructions—was already explained by the contemporary Eusebius as one of those divine miracles with which the pious emperor well knew how to play; and, finally, because the location of the sepulchre within the city, apparently so inexplicable in the face of the clear statements of the Gospels, is convincingly shown by Tobler to be satisfactorily explained as a justification of the splendid Church of the Resurrection, which the emperor built in the immediate neighbourhood.² In the absence of positive proofs it

¹ See *B. J.* 5, 4, 2; 5, 6, 2. Also *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 53. When it says in *B. J.* 5, 6, 2, that these quarters were *μη λίαν* populated, it means that this was so only in comparison with the over-population (*πλήθει ὑπερχεομένη*, *B. J.* 5, 4, 2) of the inner city. But the Gospels say, "without the city;" and in the midst of houses, even though outside of the gates, no execution took place.

² See Eusebius' description of the discovery by Constantine, *Vita Const.* 3, 25 sqq. In the *Onom.* 160: *δείκνυται πρὸς τοῖς βορείοις τοῦ Σιών ὄρους*. The two nails, which Helena found and which Constantine applied to superstitious uses, have been held in modern times to be a strong evidence against the nailing of the feet; Socrates, *H. E.* 1, 17. An extremely weak basis for reminiscences from the second century is

was inevitable that, besides the above-mentioned sites, others should have been suggested either on the east or on the north of Jerusalem. Clarke sought the sepulchre of Jesus in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, Fergusson and Unger the genuine church of Constantine in the Mosque of Omar. Thenius, and later Furrer, have tried to recognize the Hill of the Skull in the shape of the hill occupied by the Grotto of Jeremiah and surrounded by highways, on the north, north-east from the Damascus gate; whilst, finally, Noack has pointed inquirers after the place in the direction of Samaria and Nablus.¹ All these assumptions—to say nothing of Noack's fancy—are shipwrecked by the great distance of the sites from the palace of Pilate, to which Renan and Ewald have kept closer.²

The crucifixion could now begin. This mode of punishment—unintelligible to the milder Christian customs of our times, and partially suppressed throughout the civilized world three centuries after Christ by the first Christian emperor Constantine by way of propitiation to the exalted Sufferer and his followers on the cross—was distinctively pagan, and was a refined invention for the purpose of making the death of the condemned as painful as it was prolonged.³ The Jews, who in this respect, as well as

afforded by Adrian's temple of Venus on the site of the holy sepulchre; Eus. *Vita Const.* 3, 26; Jerome, *Ep.* 49; Socrates, *l. c.*; Soz. 2, 1; Sulpic. Sev. 2, 31; comp. Renan, 15th ed. pp. 430 sq.

¹ Comp. Langen, pp. 411 sq.; Arnold, in *Herzog*, V. pp. 307 sq.; Furrer, *Wand.* pp. 70 sq. (differs from his latest view in *Bib.-Lex.*); Noack, p. 249.

² Renan, 15th ed. p. 429, and Ewald, p. 575, think of a site on the north-west of the city, particularly the hill Gareb (gibeat G.), Jer. xxxi. 39. Or, Renan thinks, it might be still more to the west, on the heights that command the Valley of Hinnom, above Birket Mamilla. Ewald's opinion that the palace of Pilate was far to the east of Gareb, must be a mistake connected with his former opinion that the residence of Pilate was in Antonia; it was south (somewhat south-east) of Gareb.

³ Comp. in general the already mentioned writings; also Pauly, *R. E. crux*; H. Merz, *Kreuzigung* in *Herzog*. On Constantine, Aur. Vict. *Cæs.* 41; Soz. 1, 8; Gieseler, I. i. p. 273; Wichelhaus, p. 20. Instead of the cross, the gallows, Marq. p. 192. But in the Middle Ages, *e.g.*, Otho III. crucified the adherents of Crescentius. Crucifixion was the principal punishment in the persecutions of the Christians, at least in the first and second centuries. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 44; Eus. 3, 32; Justin, *Trypho*, 110; *Pastor Her.* Visio 3, 2; Minuc. 37. Later seldom (oftener fire, fighting with wild beasts, torture), especially in the Diocletian times. Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 11; *Hist. E.* 8, 8.

in others, were more humane than their contemporaries, did not practise this horrible custom, although they afterwards antedated crucifixion as far back as Cain and Abel. The cruel and lawless Alexander Jannæus alone once made use of it in a frightful manner, and is therefore charged by Josephus with cruelty and godlessness. Even Herod was prudent enough to avoid its use.¹ For the hanging practised upon the dead—not lightly upon the living—was something very different, although subsequently, when the Roman custom of crucifying came into vogue, the same expression was used of the latter, and Jesus, *e.g.*, was spoken of with strong opprobrium as the “hanged,” the *talui*. In fact, the Talmud, in its preference for what is Jewish as opposed to what is not Jewish, has gone so far as to assert that Jesus was stoned according to the Law, and when dead hanged upon the wood as accursed.²

It seems that the Greeks and Romans derived the punishment of the cross from the East, where it was practised by the Phœnicians, the cruel neighbours of the Jews.³ It is well known

¹ Jannæus, Jos. *B. J.* 1, 4, 6; *Ant.* 13, 14, 2. No instance under Herod, at most hanging or strangling, *Ant.* 16, 11, 7. Cain, Lightfoot, p. 57.

² Comp. Num. xxv. 4 sq.; Deut. xxi. 22; Joshua x. 26 sq.; 1 Sam. xxxi. 10; 2 Sam. iv. 12, xxi. 12 (Philistines). Ezra vi. 11 (Persians, living). As to Jesus, *Gen. Bab. Sanh.* 6: *suspenderunt eum vespera sabbati*. Lightfoot, p. 385. Comp. the interesting parallelism of the Jews and Romans, *i.e.*: *damnatum primo morte mulctarunt et dein in arbore suspenderunt*; at *mos regni*, *primum suspendere et inde morte mulctare*. To crucify, Hebr. *talab* (*talui*, *i.e.* *suspensus*, 2 Sam. xviii. 10; verb. *ignomin.* Bux. p. 2595), Aram. *s(z)ekaph* (*levo*); *zelab* (*suspendo*). The crucified (*cruciarum*) *zelibin*. Crucifixion, *s(z)ekiphut*. Cross, *sekipha*, *zeliba*, *zelub* (*patib.*), *kes* (*lignum*). *Zelibin al zelibaja*, Targ. Jos. x. 26.

³ Winer, *Kreuzigung*, enumerates the different peoples. Friedlieb, p. 130. But writers are here very credulous. When the ancients mention *ἀνασταυροῦν*, *ἀνασκολοπιζειν*, it is not necessarily crucifying, but hanging upon a post or beam, which was practised among all peoples, by the Greeks (*Odyss.* 22, 462 sq.), by the Jews (Num. xxv. 4, &c.), and even by the Germans (Tac. *Germ.* 12: *prodit. et transfugas arboribus suspendunt*), but is to be distinguished from strangling (Jos. *Ant.* 16, 11, 7; comp. *Odyss. l.c.*). Thus among the Persians there was in fact only hanging, Ezra vi. 11; Esther vii. 9; and Herodotus, 1, 128; 3, 125, 159; 4, 43; 6, 30; 7, 194, 238. Amm. 19, 9, 1, no evidence. As to the Indians, there is but little to be drawn from Diod. 2, 18; and in Egypt there was only binding (see below, p. 145, n. 3). On the other hand, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Numidians, Just. 18, 7; 21, 4; 22, 7. A. Hirt. *Bell. Afric.* 66. Crucifixion by generals, Livy, 38, 48; Val. Max. 2, 7, ext. 1. It was

that Alexander the Great, adopting the Phœnician custom of the country, caused 2000 Syrians to be nailed to the cross.¹ In Italy and Sicily the punishment of the cross dates back to ancient times, probably under Phœnician influences, and was originally inflicted only upon slaves, robbers, deserters, and cowards. Cicero says that humane masters did not inflict it even upon slaves, and Julius Cæsar caused captured pirates to be strangled before they were subjected to the mode of dishonouring the dead customary among the most various nations, viz. hanging upon the cross. Yet, notwithstanding the mildness of the Roman rule which Cicero praises, there came more and more into vogue the punishment—condemned by Seneca as barbarity—which (after the example of Carthage, where the cross threatened even generals and kings and the sons of great men) was intended, by means of an extreme severity of suffering, to demonstrate to high and low, particularly in the provinces, the absolute authority of Rome and its official representatives.² Verres, who was, it is true, crushingly condemned by Cicero, crucified Roman citizens in Messina, and Galba did the same in

said of the Phœnicians, Carthaginians: *crudelissimus hostis, exquisita supplicia*, Cic. *Offic.* 3, 27. Among the *amici reges*, crucifixion was still customary in the third century, Lampr. *A. Sev.* 28.

¹ Curt. 4, 4.

² Italy, comp. Aur. V. *Cæs.* (Const.), 41: *vetus veterrimumque supplicium patibulorum primus removit*. Liv. 1, 26 (*infelici arbori recte suspendito*, hanging); Pliny, *H. N.* 36, 24, 3 (*figere crucibus corpora defunctorum*); particularly Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6: *supplicium more majorum*; 5, 66 (*primitive custom among the Mamertines*; comp. Just. 30, 2). Slave-death, servile, infame supplicium, see Val. Max. 2, 7, 12. Gallie. *Cass.* 4. Hor. *Sat.* 1, 3, 80 sq. (2, 7, 47; *Ep.* 1, 16, 47): *servum in cruce suffigere*. *Juv.* 6, 218: *pone crucem servo*. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6: *quam damnatis* (53: *convictis maleficii*) *servis crucem fixeras*; comp. also 5, 53, 62, 63. Plant. *Mil. Glor.* 2, 4, 19. Livy, 33, 36. Hirt. *Bell. Hisp.* 20. Hence ἡ μέγιστος σταυροῦ δουλεία, Justin, *Trypho*, 134 (Phil. ii. 7). Robbers, Petron. *Sat.* 111. Cowards, deserters, Hirt. *B. Afr.* 66. Livy, 30, 43. Val. Max. 2, 7, 12. For grave crimes generally, at least in the cases of the *humiles*, Paull. 5, 23, 1. Comp. below, p. 142, n. 3, the quotation from Lact. *Inst.* 4, 26. Caesar, Suet. *Cæs.* 74. Practised upon the dead, Polyrates, Leonidas, Herodotus, 3, 125 (against Cic. *Fin.* 5, 30); 7, 238 (comp. Pliny, *H. N.* 36, 24, 3; Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 43; Plut. *Cleom.* 39). *Illa clementia imperii nostri*, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 44. - Humane masters, Cic. *p. Rab.* 5. *Suppliciorum irarumque barbaria*, Seneca, *Ir.* 3, 18. Punic example, Just. 18, 7 (Cartago); 22, 7 (Bomilcar).

Spain. The emperor Tiberius in Rome crucified Egyptian priests and even a woman; Nero, the Christians; Domitian, the servants of literature; and Avidius Cassius, officers that attacked prematurely and soldiers that plundered.¹ But in Judæa the Roman rule began and ended with crosses, "with salutary examples" without number.² After the death of Herod the Great, Varus crucified 2000 insurgents. Under the emperors Claudius and Nero, the same portion was dealt out by Tiberius Alexander, Quadratus, Felix, Festus, Florus, not only to robbers and to insurgents of either a political or a religious colour, including two sons of Judas Galilæus, but to quiet, honourable citizens and distinguished Roman knights. And before the beleaguered Jerusalem—which according to Luke was punished for the murder of Jesus—Titus daily set up cross-beams for hundreds of victims, until there was no more room, the supply of timber was exhausted, and the soldiery, for the sake of variety and sport, invented fresh methods of crucifying.³ In particular, according to the sentiments of the just then reigning emperor Tiberius, there was no more appropriate discipline for the provincials than the cross; a simple easy death he held to be no punishment, but called it the escape of the guilty.⁴

What Jesus suffered was therefore in harmony with the Roman practice of the country, and was such a customary punishment that the Jewish people spontaneously cried, "Crucify him!" The shame and the horrible character of the punishment, how-

¹ Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6: ut quam damnatis servis crucem fixeras, hanc indemnatis civibus rom. reservaris. Comp. also 5, 53, and particularly 66: facinus est vinciri civem rom., scelus verberari, prope patricidium necari; quid dicam in crucem tolli? Comp. the disapprobation expressed by Val. Max. 2, 7, 12, of Scipio Afr. I. Galba, Suet. *Galba*, 9. Tiberius, Jos. *Ant.* 18, 3, 4 (also the freed-woman Ide). Nero, Tac. *Ann.* 15, 44. Domitian, Suet. 10 (librarii).

² Res saluberrimi exempli. Livy, *Epit.* 55.

³ Varus, Jos. *Ant.* 17, 10, 10. Tib. Alex. (sons of Judas Gal.), *Ant.* 20, 5, 2. Quadratus, *B.J.* 2, 12, 6. Felix, *ib.* 2, 13, 2 (ἀπειρον πλῆθος). Festus, *ib.* 2, 14, 1. Florus (honourable citizens, knights), *ib.* 2, 14, 9. Titus, *ib.* 5, 11, 1. Thus Avidius Cassius caused even provincial officers to be crucified in Syria, Gallic. *Cass.* 4.

⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 61 (with reference to the suicide of one who was to have been executed): mortem adeo leve supplicium putabat, ut exclamaverit: Carnulius me evasit. Comp. the principle of Avidius Cassius, Gallic. *Cass.* 4: majus exemplum esse viventis miserabiliter criminosi quam occisi. Cic. *Verr.* 2, 45: mortis celeritatem pretio redimere.

ever, were not less on this account. Cicero, in his Verres orations, calls it the cruelest and the most shameful of all executions; he speaks indignantly of the crucifixion of slaves, and repeatedly with an exhibition of horror places in juxtaposition the Latin words for torture and cross as allied both in sound and derivation.¹ The Christian teachers from the first to the last, with Paul at their head, dwell in a hundred ways upon the shame and the sorrow of this servile death, this extreme punishment for the living, too harsh even for the dead.² "Should the Messiah suffer," cries the Jew Trypho to Justin Martyr, "yet he cannot be crucified; he cannot die such a shameful, dishonourable death!" Lactantius sadly asks, "Why no honourable kind of death, why this infamous one, unworthy of a free man even when he is guilty?"³

The Roman cross, to which our attention is forced, had—and this again is, as Seneca sees, a sign of a cruel spirit of invention—many forms, which the executioners brought into use side by side for the sake of variety and as an expression of contempt.⁴ Besides the simple post, which was seldom used for crucifying,

¹ Cic. *Verr.* 5, 64 : crudelissimum tæterrimumque supplicium. *Ib.* 5, 6 . illa extrema ad supplicium damnatorum, metum ceterorum, cruciatus et crux. 62 : ista pestis, quam nunquam viderat. 66 : in illum cruciatum et crucem egisti. Cic. *pro C. Rab.* 5 : crucis terror. Nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium rom., sed etiam a cognitione, oculis, auribus. Sen. *Ep.* 101 : acuta crux. Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 4 : *θαν. οίκτιστος*, most wretched death. Origen on Matt. 140 : vivunt cum plurimo cruciatu. Min. Fel. *Oct.* 9 : summum suppl., crucis ligna feralia. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19 : quæ propria atrocitas crucis. Solus a populo tam insignitur crucifixus. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 16 : insigni suppl. affectus et excruciatu.

² Paul, 1 Cor. i. 23 ; Phil. ii. 8.

³ Justin, *Trypho*, 90 : παθεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἀχθήσεται οἶδαμεν. εἰ δὲ καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ οὕτως αἰσχροῶς καὶ ἀτίμως ἀποθανεῖν διὰ τοῦ κικατηραμένου ἐν τῷ νόμῳ θανάτου, ἀπόδειξον ἡμῖν. Similarly also chap. 32. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 26 : dicat fortasse aliquis : cur, si Deus fuit, et mori voluit, non saltem *honesto* aliquo mortis genere affectus est ; cur potissimum cruce ? cur *infami genere supplicii* ? quod etiam *homine libero*, quamvis nocente, videatur *indignum*. Similarly Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 1, 36 : hominem, quod personis *infame* est *vilibus*, crucis supplicio interemtum. The *Olyss.* 22, 462, already says of hanging : μὴ καθαροῦ θανάτου.

⁴ Seneca, *Cons. ad Marc.* 20 : video istic cruces non unius quidem generis, sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas, &c. Jos. *B. J.* 5, 11, 1 : προσήλουν οἱ στρατ. ἄλλον ἄλλῃ σχήματι πρὸς χλεύην.

there was an oblique cross of two beams which intersected each other in the middle at acute angles, like the strokes of the Latin letter X. There was also a rectangular cross like the letter T, and of this there were two varieties, the cross which was simply joined and in which as a rule the shorter and transverse beam was merely attached to the top of the perpendicular post, and the inserted cross in which the perpendicular post projected above the inserted transverse beam.¹ Christian tradition from very early times fixed upon the second and third forms of the cross; and further, although the second is evidently the earlier form, was used by the Phœnicians, is described by Lucian in the second century, and is the first mentioned by the Fathers from Barnabas and Tertullian, yet the third form, that which has four ends and is mentioned by Justin and Irenæus, has victoriously established itself in Christian art.² The question has been settled among Christians rather upon accidental grounds than upon any other. At most a certain historical value attaches to the unanimous rejection of the diagonal cross, notwithstanding the mystic name of Christ which it suggested to the Greeks. This rejection was, at any rate, a proof that this evidently more cruel form was too seldom employed to allow of the supposition that it was used in the case of Jesus. The inserted cross with four ends, however, owed its victory in tradition to mystic relations of another kind; and the historical cross of Jesus was most probably the T of Lucian the scoffer. These crosses, moreover, were not so high as they are generally represented, except in rare cases in which it was desired to make a great and conspi-

¹ Comp. Friedl. p. 146; Langen, p. 321; Merz, in *Herzog*, V. pp. 55, 65. *Crux commissæ, immissæ, ib.*

² Lucian, *Judic. Vocal.* 12 (τὸ ταῦ). Also *Barn.* 9: σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ T ἔμελλεν εἶχεν τ. χάριν. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 22: ipsa est enim littera Græcorum Thau, nostra autem T species crucis. Also Jerome, *Ezech.* 9. Also the figure of the antenna (ἰστίον, sail-yard), with its cornua (κέρατα), Just. *Ap.* I. 55. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 18, and Paul. Nol. allude to the same. The antenna = T (Auson.). Comp. A. Baumstark, in Pauly's *R. W. V.* p. 463. Just. *Trypho.* 91. Irenæus, 2, 24, 4: habitus crucis fines et summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine et duos in latitudine et unum in medio, in quo requiescit is, qui clavis affigitur. Comp. on the Fathers, Langen, pp. 321 sqq.

cuous example before the people, or to give a contemptuous distinction to the condemned, as when the governor Galba in Spain caused a lofty and white-painted cross to be erected for the satisfaction of a condemned man who protested against such a punishment.¹ The cross was high enough if the feet of the delinquent did not touch the ground; the wood was not to be wasted, and it had to be kept in mind that the condemned must be able himself to carry the transverse beam of his cross.² Thus, at Jesus's crucifixion, it is assumed that he was raised at most only one or two feet above the ground, so that a short hyssop stalk would suffice to carry the vinegar sponge to his mouth.³ The wood chosen was that which could be most easily obtained, and the beams were shaped roughly; in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem olive wood would most probably be employed.⁴

It was by no means usual for the cross to be kept standing ready at the place of execution, and as a rule the upright part of the cross, without the transverse beam, was set up before the condemned was fastened to it. It very seldom occurred that the condemned was crucified upon the wood as it lay on the ground to be afterwards set upright.⁵ The malefactor was

¹ Suet. *Galb.* 9: multo præter ceteras altiore et dealbatam statui crucem jussit. Just. 18, 7: cum ornatu suo in altiss. crucem in conspectu urbis suffigi jussit. 22, 7: de summa cruce. Charit. 57, 20 (saw the sea from the cross). Artem. *Oneir.* 1, 76; 2, 53: καὶ γὰρ ἰψηλὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς. Comp. the envy excited by a high cross, in *Anthol. II. ap. Rigalt. not.* in J. G. Reiff, *Artem.* II. p. 102: μακροτέρῳ στ. σταυρούμενον ἄλλον ἑαυτοῦ ὁ φθονερός Διοφῶν ἐγγὺς ἰδὼν ἐτάκη.

² Artem. *On.* 2, 53: εἴργει ὁ σταυρὸς τῇ γῇ ἐπιβαίνειν. Hence pendere, Petr. 111; κρέμασθαι, Eus. 5, 1.

³ Merz, in Herzog, V. pp. 65 sq. The footboard (suppedaneum, tabula, in Christian pictures, and already in Aug. and Greg. Tur.) did not exist. Langen, p. 311. Hyssop in John, only a foot long.

⁴ Friedlieb, pp. 134 sq.

⁵ Against Pauly, article *Crux*. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 6: quam damnatis servis crucem fixeras. 62: crux comparabatur. 66: quid attinuit, cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem, te jubere in ea parte figere. Illa crux sola illo loco fixa est. Comp. Cic. *pro Rab.*: defigere. Juv. 6, 218: pone crucem servo. Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 4: κελεύει καταπήγνυσθαι τ. σταυρόν. Hence in crucem agere, tollere, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 63, 66. Τὸ ὀρθιον ξύλον, Justin, *Trypho*, 91. Friedl. p. 142. Langen, pp. 294, 309.

stripped naked by the executioners, and then attached by the soldiers to the transverse part of the cross, which might consist of either one or two pieces of wood. If of two, the upper part of the back and the neck were pressed into the already described *patibulum*; if of one, they only leant against the beam; but in both cases the hands were stretched out and bound to the ends of the beam or beams.¹ But now came the most dreadful part of the proceeding.² Whilst even in Egypt crucifixion was performed with cords, Carthage and Rome employed iron nails.³ Strong sharp-pointed iron nails—upon the subsequent acquiring of which superstition laid great stress—were driven into the hands, first into the right and then into the left, until they passed through and were firmly fastened in the wood.⁴ The wretched man was lifted, by cords and with the help of ladders, to the top of the post to which the middle of the cross beam was now attached either by being inlet or bound on. He was placed upon the insignificant horn-like peg, the *sedile*, which projected from the middle of the cross, and was intended not to ease the sufferer, but to support his weight which otherwise would have torn the limbs from the nails, and even

¹ Plaut. *Mil. Gl.* 2, 4, 7: *dispressis manibus*. Tert. *Nat.* 1, 12: *manibus expansis*. Sen. *ad. Marc.* 20: *brachia patibulo explicuerunt*. Arr. *Epist.* 3, 26: *ἐκτείνας ἑαυτὸν ὡς οἱ ἐσταυρωμένοι*. Luc. *Prom. Cauc.* 1: *ἐκπεταθὲς τῷ χεῖρσι*. Artem. *On.* 1, 76: *χειρῶν ἔκτασις*. Justin, *Ap.* 1, 35: *ἐξεράθη τ. κείρας*. Eus. 8, 7: *χεῖρας ἑφαπλοῦν*. Act. *Pil.* B. 10 (C): *ταυόσαντες*. Tert., *Jud.* 13, sees here Is. lxx. 2. A single beam is suggested by Justin's and Tertullian's *antenna* (antenna, sail-yard), Just. *Ap.* I. 55; Tert. *Marc.* 3, 18 sq., *Jud.* 13.

² Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19: *foderunt manus meas et pedes, quæ propria atrocità crucis*.

³ According to Xen. Eph. 4, 2 (Winer, *Krenz*), in Egypt the hands and feet were only bound. Volkmar's *Archæol.* p. 591: the hands and feet were only in exceptional cases pierced by nails.

⁴ Cruci figere, Suet. *Dom.* 11; affigere, Petr. 112. Cruci fixus, Quint. *Inst.* 7, 1, 30. Suffigere in cruci, Horace, *Sat.* 1, 3, 80, &c. Nervos suff. clavis, Tert. *Jud.* 10. Acuta crux, Sen. *Ep.* 101. Clavos adigere, Sen. *Vit. beat.* 19. Clavis a cruce (magical medium), Pliny, *H.N.* 28, 11. Also among the Jews masmera min hazelub (cross nails), Bux. p. 1910. First the right, then the left hand, Luc. *Prometh. Cauc.* 1, 2. That the hand nails were driven into the patib. before the latter was attached to the cross, is shown particularly by Firm. Mat. *Astr.* 6, 31: *patibulo suffixus in crucem crudeliter erigitur*. Thus also Marq. *l. c.*

endangered the attachment of the transverse beam.¹ Next the feet, after having been duly stretched downwards, were fastened to the post. This was done either by driving an iron spike through each foot, or the feet were placed together and one larger spike was driven through both. The mere binding of the feet, which Paulus so vigorously defended at Heidelberg in order not to interfere with Jesus's walking power when raised up, contradicts the clear testimony of the ancients, who introduce the third and even the fourth nail, not merely to satisfy a passage in the Psalms, but because they had themselves witnessed crucifixions.² The torture of those thus crucified and their wretched death, which came slowly even to those crucified head

¹ Stripping, see below, pp. 148 sqq. Cord, comp. John xxi. 18, and Tert. *Scorp.* 15: Petrus ab altero vincitur, cum cruci adstringitur. Spartum e cruce, a magical medium, Pliny, *H. N.* 28, 11. Hence of a sorceress, Lucan. *Phars.* 6, 543 sq.: laqueum nodosque nocentes ore suo rupit, &c. Hilary, *d. Trin.* 10, 13: funium vincula. The sitting peg (sessuro, Sen. *Ep.* 101), called πῆγμα, Justin, *Trypho*, 91: τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον ὡς κέρασ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστίν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται (ride thereon) οἱ σταυρουμένοι. Similarly, Ir. *Her.* 2, 24, 4. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 18: unicornis medius, stipitis palus. Comp. Langen, p. 310; Merz, p. 66. We have no certain information as to the fastening of the patibulum to the crux. Without doubt the attachment was made by other means than merely by the body of the delinquent, who disspessis in patib. manibus and sedens in cruce, participated in both. The connection would be a loose one. The T also points to an independent attachment either by nails, or by cords which *antenna* would suggest. Justin, *Trypho*, 91, employs the expression προσαρμόζεται τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον to the ὄρθιον ἐν.

² Stretching the feet, *Acta Pil.* B. 10 in C.: σὶραντες κάτωθεν. The nailing of the feet of Jesus is assumed in Luke xxiv. 40; in John xx. 25, 27, the unhistorical wound in the side is substituted for it (followed by Origen, *c. Cels.* 2, 59). Also Justin, *Ap.* 1, 35; *Trypho*, 97, 104 (certainly on the ground of Ps. xxii. 16). Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19, and his successors (Langen, p. 317), are for foot nails. Whilst Lucian, *Prom. Cauc.* 1, 2, Lucan. 6, 547, speak only of hand nails, great value attaches to the Jewish tradition (Lightfoot, p. 57: Abel, in hands and feet), and still more to the passage in Plautus, *Mostel.* 2, 1, 13, where a condemned man seeks a substitute, promising much, but also strictly requiring: offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia, of which the preferable explanation is that which finds the harshness of the requirement in the twice repeated piercing of each limb, and not in an exceptional nailing of the feet, which it has been quite erroneously sought to establish even in Tert. (passage quoted above, p. 142, n. 1, p. 145, n. 2). Thus also Marq. *L.c.* Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 513; *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. p. 395. The other, Renan, 15th ed. p. 433. On Paulus (for whom, *c.g.* Herder, Winer, Schleier. p. 447, Bunsen, p. 415; comp. Volkmar, p. 591), and the course of the controversy, *Handb.* pp. 669 sqq.; Langen, pp. 312 sqq. The Plautus passage directly supports four nails. On this controversy (three or four), Langen, p. 317, Meyer, and Bleek.

downwards (an aggravation of the punishment), must be considered further on.¹

This fate now actually befel Jesus. It did not, as in many cases, remain a mere menace, the execution of which was relinquished in view of the sorrow of the unfortunate prisoner, or in response to the intercession of loudly lamenting and sobbing multitudes.¹ The command was iron, and no one pleaded for Jesus.² Troops of soldiers surrounded the spot, which no one seems to have been permitted to approach.³ The three crosses were set up side by side, the cross of Jesus, in special recognition of his higher position, being placed in the middle.⁴ A generous Jewish—not Roman—custom afforded the condemned a slight alleviation of their pain. Before the execution they were given a stupefying drink; according to the Babylonian Talmud, the cup was generally due to the compassion of women of position in Jerusalem, and was offered by them—not exactly in person—when the condemned were led forth to execution.⁵ The old Jewish accounts speak of grains of frankincense dissolved in wine; Matthew, in

¹ Sen. *Cons. ad Marc.* 20; Eus. 3, 1; 8, 8 sq.; Fr. p. 146.

² See the stratagem of the legate Bassus against Machærus. By scourging and threatening to crucify the captured Eleazar he brought about the capitulation, Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 4. The Jews sobbed aloud in view of the cross, οὐκ ἀνασχέρων εἶναι τ. πάθος βούντες.

³ Matt. xxvii. 39, 55. A closer proximity might be indicated by versé 41 in relation to verse 44, and verse 46 in relation to verse 47. The former proves nothing, and the one who gave him to drink in vv. 46 sqq. may (see below) have been only a soldier. According to *Acta Pil.* B. 10, the women were not driven afar off until afterwards.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 38, and par. passages. I do not believe here either in an actual or an idealized representation of a regal throne, 1 Kings xxii. 19. For the historical truth of the circumstance in the text, Weisse, p. 465, among others. Even Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 520. Sceptical, Volkmar, p. 593. "Ἐστησαν σταυρὸν, *Acta Pil.* B. 10.

⁵ *Bab. Sanh.* f. 43, 1: prodeunti ad suppl. capitis potum dederunt, granum thuris in poculo vini, ut turbaretur intellectus ejus (according to Prov. xxxi. 6); traditioque est, feminas generosas Hierosolymitanas hoc e spontaneo sumptu suo exhibuisse. Lightfoot, pp. 56, 386. Wetst. p. 635. Thol. p. 365. The drink might have been prepared from poppies (rosh, me rosh, i. e. opium, Jer. viii. 14) or wormwood (laanah). Simpson, the discoverer of chloroform, thought of hashish, the Indian extract of hemp. There is nothing in the assertion of Grätz, III. p. 245, that the Gospels represent the act of compassion as one of severity. The retiring character of the women, 2 Macc. iii. 19; above, I. p. 280, n. 1; III. p. 309, n. 2.

the case of Jesus, of a mixture of wine and wormwood, Mark, of wine and myrrh, both aromatic plants of properties similar to those of frankincense. Matthew's drink of gall was no more used than his drink of vinegar, both of which have been recently so well explained by a reference to Psalm lxix. 21.¹ The drink was offered to Jesus evidently by the Roman soldiers, who adopted the Jewish custom or had received the present for that purpose from the Jewish women; and there is no need for the supposition of a mixture of it with their own sour soldier's beverage, the *posca*. It is true that Jesus, as soon as he had tasted the gift of cruel compassion, rejected it, doubtless—as has always been held—because it was his will to look death in the face with unclouded consciousness.²

The condemned were now stripped, fastened, and one after another lifted up, Jesus being crucified the first.³ The Acts of Pilate indulge in fanciful statements about the girding of Jesus with a white linen cloth, the clothing of him with a scarlet

¹ Matt. xxvii. 34: ἔδωκαν πίνειν οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον (οἶνον, Sin., Vat., Bez., &c., instead of ὄξος, although the latter is already in *Barn.* 7, Tert. *Spect.* 30, Ital. (partly), *Acta Pil.* 10, Alex., St. Gall.). Mark ἐσμυρτισμένον οἶνον. Since the criticism of the text (which Volk., p. 597, did not know) has got rid of vinegar from Ps. lxi. 21, so together with that, as there is no question of maltreatment, the usual false meaning attached to χολή must also give way; the word signifies not only gall (thus the Fathers, Tert. *Spect.* 30: felle et aceto, and most recent critics, especially Strauss, Bleek, Meyer, Schenkel, Weisse, Volkmar), but also in the LXX. (Prov. v. 4; Lam. iii. 15) wormwood (laanah, absinthium). Comp. Gesenius, Grimm. Thus Paulus, Kuin., Hug. Friedlieb, Krabbe, Langen, Steinm. p. 171. Thus also the controversy about the superiority of Matt. (Lightfoot, Grimm) or Mark (recent critics) falls to the ground. Lightfoot ingeniously thought that Mark gives the good Jewish drink which ought to have been offered, Matthew the bad drink which was really offered by the Scribes and the foes of Jesus. Recent critics (down to Renan, Strauss) have sought, on the other hand, in the vinegar of Matthew the *posca* of the Romans. Matt. xxvii. 48. Christians also gave similar drinks to martyrs. Tert. *Jej.* 12: condito mero. Aug. *Fruet. Tarr.* 3: conditi permixti poculum. Neander, p. 570.

² Comp. the difference (noticed also by Origen on Matthew, 128) between Matt. xxvii. 34 and Mark xv. 23. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 36: ut doloris patientiam mortisque contentum traderet homini, certainly not immediately in this connection. Another explanation, Origen, 127. Comp. Amos ii. 12; and the Essenes: οἶνος φάρμακον ἀποσύνης, above, I. p. 374. Steinm., p. 171, thinks of 1 Cor. x. 21.

³ Matt. xxvii. 35, 38 (also Mark) is against the contemporaneousness of the executions, which in Luke xxiii. 33 is possible. In *Acta Pil.* B. 10, that of Jesus is made to precede the others (ἀνεβίβασαν).

woollen robe, and the pressing of the crown of thorns afresh upon his head; and the Fathers think that he had kept the crown of thorns upon his head all the way from the city.¹ Recently critics have been strongly inclined to believe that Jesus was furnished with at least such a cloth round his loins as is mentioned in the first form of the Acts of Pilate. But the evidence for this hitherto collected is not quite sufficient, since Artemidor attests the nudity of those that were crucified; and the delicate attention which was required (and that only in former times) in the case of athletes would not be required in the case of a criminal, especially among soldiers who lacked any sense of propriety, and who looked upon the clothes of the victim as their booty.² Certainly the view that Jesus wore a linen cloth is not strengthened by the existence of linen relics at Aix-la-Chapelle and elsewhere; but it acquires probability from the fact that among "barbarians" and, as can be proved, at Jewish executions the attention above referred to was shown, and that in other respects regard was paid to Jewish usage.

With the nailing to the upright post—the description of which the Gospels have considerably spared us—the execution was completed. The blow upon the breast, below the shoulders, very usual among the Romans for the sake of hastening death, does

¹ *Acta Pil.* A. 10 (περιέζωσαν αὐτὸν λέντιον); B. 10 (ἐνέδυσαν ῥάσον κόκκινον). Perhaps already after existing pictures. Lipsius, p. 40. Tert. *Adv. Jud.* 13: inherens cornibus crucis corona spinea in capite ejus circumdata. Comp. Origen, 125. Lact. 4, 26.

² The Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 35) speak of a distribution of garments. In reference to the heathen, Artemid. 2, 53: γυμνοὶ γὰρ σταυροῦνται. An exception, Cartalo, Just. 18, 7: cum ornato suo. Langen, pp. 304 sqq., appeals to Matt. xxvii. 55, John xxi. 18, to the Græco-Roman custom (Thuc. 1, 6), and to the vague meaning of γυμνός (comp. Eus. 6, 40; 8, 9); but on the Græco-Roman modesty, comp., besides Thuc., Dio C. 58, 2; 48, 44; and on the modesty of the soldiers in the presence of the Jews, Jos. *Ant.* 20, 5, 3. Polycarp stripped himself entirely, Eus. 4, 15. At the execution of women, the παντελῶς γυμνή was certainly held to be unheard of, Eus. 8, 9; *Mart. Pal.* 9. The best evidence is brought by Langen out of the Talmud. Among the Jews, namely, there was a certain amount of covering, *Sanh.* c. 6, h. 3: denudant (when stoned) vestibus virumque tegunt a parte priori, &c. (Lightfoot, p. 386). Barbarians (Asiatics), Thuc. *l. c.* Hase and Meyer mistrust the evidences; and the Fathers Athan., Ambrose, Origen, speak of perfect nudity. Comp. also Paulus, p. 668.

not seem to have been given. According to Origen, it was omitted to gratify Jewish passion; and the unhappy sufferers were now left to sob out their time until tardy death became their deliverer.¹ As a further insult, the official white tablet, the *sanis*, which had already accompanied the procession to the place of execution and contained the "title" of the crime as well as the name of the criminal in Greek, Latin, and it is alleged also in Hebrew, was placed above the head of Jesus, as much in mockery as in obedience to the formal custom.² The Gospels have reproduced the title somewhat variously; Luke and Mark give only the offence, Matthew adds the name, and John further adds the native place. The briefest was the most correct: The King of the Jews! *Rex Judæorum*. Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. *Malka di Jehudaje* would have been the Hebrew, *i.e.* the Aramaic.³ A genuine Pilate-sarcasm with a double sting; the most tangible

¹ Sen. *De Ira*, 1, 16: constituti sunt in eodem loco perituri tres ob unius innocentiam. *Vita B.* 19: ad supplicium acti stipitibus singulis pendent. The blow, Origen upon Matt. 140: non jussit sec. consuetud. Romanorum de his, qui cruci figuntur, percuti sub alas corporis Jesu.—Majorem sustinent cruciatum, qui non percutiuntur post fixationem, sed vivunt cum plur. cruciatu. Sen. *Ep.* 101: in fœdum scapularum ac pectoris tuber elisus.

² Matt. xxvii. 37 and par. pass. The *σανίς*, see above, p. 127, n. 1. Hesych.: τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, Steinm. p. 177. The inscription in Eus. 5, 1, best corresponds: πίνακος αὐτὸν προάγοντος, ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο Ῥωμαῖστί· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἄτταλος ὁ Χριστιανός. Hence the incorrectness of Steinmeyer's view (p. 176), that Pilate (according to John) subsequently sent out the *titulus*. The three languages in Luke xxiii. 38 (well attested, notwithstanding Tisch., especially Sin., Alex., Bez., It., and on account of the difference from John not to be explained from his report): Greek, Roman, Hebrew (also *Acta Pil.* A. 10); in John xix. 20: Hebrew, Roman, Greek. The sequence was: Roman, Greek, *Jos. Ant.* 14, 12, 5 (Roman decree for Tyre), also 14, 10, 3 (for Tyre, Sidon, Askalon); on the contrary, Josephus in *Ant.* 14, 10, 2; *B. J.* 5, 5, 2; 6, 2, 4 (the pillars of prohibition in the temple), places first the Greek as better known to himself. Pilate's writers would scarcely have an intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew, which John purposely and ostentatiously places first. There is no other example, unless we think of the grave of Gordian, on which the soldiers græcis, latinis, persicis, judaïcis, egyptiacis literis titulum addiderunt, *Capit. Gord.* 34. Volkmar, p. 595: the three languages useless verbiage!

³ Mark xv. 26 has the briefest, the genuinely Roman (Langen); Luke xxiii. 38 is polished, comp. Attalus, in the previous note. Many, as Ewald, p. 574, Steinm. p. 177, are in favour of the full formula with the name. For the briefest form, Renan, 15th ed. p. 434. According to Langen, John xix. 19 gives the Hebrew inscription. On the Aram. see Dan. iii. 8; Ezra iv. 12.

mental revelation of the demoniacal man upon whom the Christian sources have expended so much praise for the feebleness of his opposition. The fourth Gospel, however, is incorrect in stating that the high-priest had taken objection to the title—which contained an insult to the nation itself—and had somewhat bluntly asked for another form: “The pretended King.” This objection would certainly be quite in harmony with the brutality of the first proceedings of the Sanhedrists according to this Gospel, but not with the actual distribution of authority. It also contradicts the report of the earlier Gospels that the same persons a moment after scoffed at Jesus under the official title of King of the Jews.¹ The active work of the executioners was finished when, according to old Roman usage, they shared among themselves the clothes—mantle and under garment—of the condemned. Perhaps they cast lots for this in a brazen helmet, as is shown by the Gospels, which, however, here endeavour—John doing it in the most determined and unhistorical way—to obtain a fulfilment of prophecy. Four of the executioners were then placed near each cross, where they entered upon the less diverting task of keeping watch, which they performed lying on the ground, and from which they would expect to be relieved by other men in a few hours, about midnight.² The captain himself,

¹ John xix. 20; comp. Matt. xxvii. 42.

² Matt. xxvii. 35 (the express reference to the Old Testament is spurious). Mark xv. 24 (paraphrastic). Luke xxiii. 34 (simple). John xix. 23 sq. (wholly artificial), with express distinction of the two garments, mantle and body coat, with quartering of the mantle, casting lots for the unsewn woven body garment, finally also with express appeal to Ps. xxii. 18 (literally according to LXX.), and expressed in such a way that the Old Testament parallelism of sentences (as in Matt. xxi. 3, 5) is so misunderstood or misemployed that the division of the mantle and the casting of lots for the body coat are actually found in the Psalm. This Johannine representation, preferred even by Theile, must be rejected (although Tholuck on the passage believes in the fulfilment; Krabbe with more reserve, p. 499; Steinm. p. 172), since the artificiality in itself, when read in connection with the Psalm and the Synoptics (where the *ἱμάτιον*, mantle and coat, Matt. xxvii. 31, xvii. 2, are both distributed by the casting of lots), is too evident. Another objection is the introduction of the peculiar body coat, which was not in use among the people (Schol. Cod. 36, in Wetst. p. 955; on the other hand, Neander, p. 570: Galilean dress of the poor, according to Isid. Pel. *Ep.* 1, 74!), but belonged simply to the dress of the high-priests, Jos. *Ant.* 3, 7, 4 (comp. Ewald, p. 246); and its introduction here betrays the unhistorical endeavour to vindicate or

who like his company was answerable with his life for the due performance of his commission, was compelled to remain constantly on the spot.¹

The most certain fact connected with these bitter hours of Jesus, is his foes' triumphant scorn, a scorn which it was still the custom among hot-blooded Jews to exhibit towards persons that had been put to death, but as to which the fourth Gospel has purposely preserved a complete silence.² Many persons, but

to symbolize Jesus as *high-priest* (comp. above, III. p. 277, n. 3; and the description of John by Polycrates, above, I. p. 223; also John xviii. 15). In the garment without seam, as well as in John xxi. 11, Strauss suspects an allusion to the oneness of the Church. But since the Synoptics, when they describe the distribution of the clothes by the casting of lots, also are exposed to the suspicion of having thought of the Psalm—even though they refrained from mentioning it in order here, as elsewhere in the history of the Passion, to surprise the reader with involuntary unprepared reminiscences—one may be uncertain (comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 525; *New Life of J.*, Eng. trans. II. p. 371) both as to the distribution of the clothes and the casting of lots. A justification of the account is certainly not to be sought in Just. *Ap.* I. 35, who boldly appeals to the *Acta Pilati* (see C. 10), but in the Roman customs, the observance of which the Evangelists knew of or assumed, and in the historical manner which the Evangelists have exhibited, in Matt. xxvii. 34, notwithstanding Old Testament parallels. The Roman law afterwards forbade—a fact altogether overlooked—the *speculatores*, also the representatives of the leading people (*optiones*), to take the *spolia* of executed persons, which *spolia* were to be placed in the judicial treasury (Geib, p. 672). The language in *Dig.* 47, 20, de bon. damnat. L. 6 (Wetst. p. 536; Paulus, p. 761): *ista (pannicularia in custodia, spolia in supplicio) neque speculatores ultra sibi vindicent neque optiones ea desiderent, quibus spoliatur, quo momento quis punitus est*, shows what was formerly customary. But when two articles had to be distributed among four soldiers, it was very natural to have recourse to the favourite plan of casting lots, comp. Virgil, *Æn.* 5, 490 sq.: *convenere viri dejectamque ærea sortem accepit galea* (as in other cases urns, hydria, sitella). The watch, Matt. xxvii. 36. John xix. 23 mentions four men. In Acts xii. 4, *τέσσαρα τετραῖα* appear for the day, in which case the *τετρ.* was again divided on duty (verse 6). Also Philo, *Flacc.* § 13: *στρατιώτης τῶν ἐν τοῖς τετραδαῖς φυλάκων*. Polyb. 6, 33, 7: *τ. φυλακῆόν ἐστιν ἐκ τεττάρων ἀνδρῶν*. Comp. Wetst. II. p. 525.

¹ Responsibility, Matt. xxviii. 14. Acts xii. 19. Sen. *Ir.* 1, 16: *ipsum centur., qui damnatum reduxerat, duci jussit. "Quia jussus occidere imperatori non paruisti."* Petron. *Sat.* 112: *miles (qui cruce servabat, 111) vidit unam sine cadavere crucem: veritus supplicium, &c. 111: laxata custodia*. Origen on Matt., 129, quite incorrectly mentions the mil. servants submissi a princip. sacerdotum on account of a fear of theft.

² Matt. xxvii. 39 sqq.; evidently attested also by Paul, Rom. xv. 3. In John only glorification, for the exaltation begins on the cross, and even the Jews are to recognize it, viii. 28. Here Luke xxiii. 48 is thrown back to the beginning of the act. Derision of foes, Jos. *B.J.* 4, 5, 2; 4, 5, 4.

no great mass of the people such as Luke introduces, looked on silently and pensively. No one did what was often done for friends and benefactors, no one entreated with lamentation and sighing that Jesus might be taken down from the cross. Some in passing blasphemed the weakness of this Messiah: "If thou art the Son of God, save thyself, descend from the cross!"¹ The victors, the Sanhedrists and their adherents, having now so certainly, so safely, attained their end, scoffed the loudest: "Others has he saved, himself he cannot save! He is the King of Israel, he destroys and builds the temple in three days: let him now descend from the cross; we would see it, and then we will all believe!"² Tradition has interpolated, especially in Matthew, several expressions of scorn from the Psalm (xxii.) in which some, Tertullian in particular, have found the death and life of the Messiah so richly foretold.³ Jesus's fellow-sufferers also joined the chorus; according to Luke, the soldiers again lent their aid in mocking him.⁴ A small company represented the sorrow, the fellowship of Jesus. Not one of the Apostles was present, and we are first reminded of them by Luke, who speaks of the presence of all Jesus's acquaintance, though every one was absent, even Joseph of Arimathea, and John, whom the fourth Gospel brings to the spot simply to save his honour. Jesus's mother was also absent, and again appears only in the fourth Gospel,

¹ Multitudes only in Luke xxiii. 35, 48. *Acta Pil.* 10. Spectatores mentioned Sen. *Vit. Beat.* 19. Ingens concursus, *ib.* *De Ir.* 1, 16. Saving the condemned and crucified, Jos. *Vita*, 75; *B. J.* 7, 6, 4. Cic. *ad Quint.* 1, 2, 2; *Verr.* 5, 6. Herodotus, 7, 194. Son of God, Matt. xxvii. 40, comp. Mark xv. 30.

² Matt. xxvii. 41 sq.; Luke xxiii. 35; Mark xv. 31. He had raised the dead! Just. *Ap.* 1, 38; still more copiously, *Acta Pil.* B. 10. Evidently we must ascribe also Matt. xxvii. 40 and Mark xv. 29, not to the people, but to the theologians.

³ Matt. xxvii. 39 (Mark xv. 29), xxvii. 43 (comp. Mark xv. 32). Luke xxiii. 35 is after Ps. xxii. 7 sq. (comp. Micah vii. 10; Dan. vi. 23), to the very expressions of the LXX. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 526 (on the contrary, Steinmeyer, p. 179), without denying the derisive shaking of the head, contends that the opponents could scarcely have used the unallowable words from Ps. xxii. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19: si adhuc queris dominicæ crucis prædicationem, satis tibi potest facere vices, prim. psalmus, *totam Christi continens passionem*. Similarly 4, 42 (twice).

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32, comp. Luke xxiii. 39. Soldiers, Luke xxiii. 36 (comp. below). Military derision exhibited even at the cross, Jos. *B. J.* 5, 11, 1.

though she did not go to Jerusalem with Jesus. But a number of Galilean women—whose presence has been with senseless fanaticism denied by the most recent criticism—were there, chief among them being Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger, and Salome the mother of the young men James and John, who shortly before had desired to share the throne of Jesus.¹ They saw the cross-peg as his throne, but they did not cease to love. They stood anxious and abashed and with breaking hearts afar off. The courage of their presence and the fervour of their love could prove to the Lord, if he saw them and if he still believed in himself, that women were the rocks of his community, even should the faith of the Apostles be overthrown like a house of sand in the Messianic storm.²

But how stood it with *him* when—so much more sorrowfully than Bomilcar the king, or Cartalo the general's son in purple and priestly robes, had looked upon Carthage, Publius Gavius the Roman citizen upon the Sicilian sea and the Italian coast—he looked from the height of his hill, of his cross, upon Jerusalem, his kingdom, and compared his vocation with the reality?³ Our sources give us, it is true, hourly and almost more than hourly reports, not only of his condition, but also of the strength and tone of his spiritual life. They present us with his sayings on the cross, the famous seven utterances which relate his torment and his soul's sorrow, still more his soul's rest, his forgiving love,

¹ Matt. xxvii. 55; Mark xv. 40; Luke xxiii. 49; John xix. 25. John's Gospel unhistorically transforms the distant position into a near one (as in xviii. 15); it is unhistorical also as to Mary (comp. *Acta Pil.* B. 10), and the three Marys (above, III. p. 276, n. 3), as well as John (also *Acta Pil.*). Olshausen thought: at first afar off, then near! The contrary, *Acta Pil.* B. 10. Volkmar, p. 605: but why had they accompanied him out of Galilee?

² Comp. the courage of Mary and John, in *Acta Pil.*, above, p. 132.

³ Just. 18, 7. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 66. Comp. particularly Bomilcar, Just. 22, 7: in medio foro a Pœnis patibulo suffixus est, ut *idem locus monumentum suppliciorum* ejus esset, qui *antea fuerat ornamentum honorum*. Also see Tert. *Jud.* 10: lignarius aliquis rex. Juv. 13, 105: ille crucem pretium sceleris tulit, hic diadema. On the other side, Gall. *Cass.* 4: milites, qui aliquid tulissent per vim in *illis ipsis locis, in quibus peccaverunt*, in crucem sustulit. Nevertheless, regnans a ligno, Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19. Barn. 8.

his care for home and church, his assurance of victory upon earth and of entrance into heaven. But it is much to be feared that a great part of these traditions belong less to the person of Jesus than to the Christianity that is deeply interested in Jesus, and that the traditions are largely only a vivid and vigorous expression of the Christian sentiment which longed to see and hear the Redeemer upon Golgotha, and upon Golgotha in particular. It is very easy to see that the stream of tradition is continually growing, both in external grandeur and in charm of colouring, as it passes from the earlier to the later sources. We find that Luke and John have substituted for the silence of Jesus various utterances of different kinds in favour of foes or friends, and have substituted bright moments for dark. The cry of forsakenness in Matthew and Mark has completely disappeared in Luke, and in John has been diminished to a cry of thirst. Finally, the well-attested wordless death-cry has been heightened and developed, until in Luke it is Jesus' committal of his soul into the hands of God, and in John a declaration of accomplishment. These indications speak for themselves; but they can be supported in detail by many observations. Every one is reluctant to lose these pearls from the lips of Jesus; yet they remain pearls even though they owe their origin merely to Christians, especially when these thoughts are loftily conceived and are the correct exposition of the latest emotions of the dying Redeemer.¹

The words of forgiveness spoken by Jesus in Luke are wrongly ascribed to the first hour.² After the crucifixion was completed Jesus is made to cry: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" This utterance, repeated in the history of the sufferings of Stephen and of James, is quite in the spirit of that

¹ Recent criticism is uniformly unwilling to decide whether all these utterances are to be questioned or some of them held possible; thus Strauss, Ewald, Weisse, Renan, Schenkel, Weizsäcker. The last, p. 568, has spoken out with commendable candour. On the other hand, Neander, Krabbe, Steinm., and others, fight for every word.

² Luke xxiii. 34; Acts iii. 17, vii. 60 (is original in contrast with Luke, and perhaps primitive; "weigh not their sins against them." Thus also *Acta Pil.* B. c. 10, opp. A.). James, in Hegesip. Eus. 2, 23.

teaching of Jesus which enjoins forgiveness and the rendering of good for evil, although there is nothing in the passages in which this teaching is found to suggest that his forgiveness would obtain forgiveness from God.¹ But those Evangelists have written more correctly who have represented him as keeping silence in this moment of extreme physical and mental torment, rather than as exhibiting a reaction of violent superhuman heroism foreign to his sound human nature, and as being full of Old Testament reminiscences.² Moreover, the utterance does not accord with the concrete situation. It cannot apply to the Roman officials, the blind instruments; and yet it must refer to them, for no others stood near, and it was only they who at this moment drove in the frightful nails which impelled him to speak. And if it is intended to apply, by a kind of abstract act of thought, to the real authors of his sufferings, the Jews, as Schleiermacher holds, had it not a moment before happened that Jesus made to the Jews, even to the women of Jerusalem, a dark announcement of divine judgment?³ In close connection with this utterance stands in the same Gospel the later utterance of the robber. One of the two who were crucified with Jesus—whose names are given to us as Dysmās and Gestas (Stegas) by the Acts of Pilate, and their deeds by the mediæval “Narrative of Joseph”—mocked Jesus, while the other—according to the Acts of Pilate the one hanging on the right, Dysmās, according to his name perhaps the representative of the West—rebuked his fellow, confessed his own sin and the innocence of Jesus, and besought Jesus to remember him graciously when he came with his kingdom; and Jesus promised the penitent admit-

¹ Matt. v. 44. Krabbe, p. 496: genuine, because in harmony with the life of love.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 518, refers to Is. liii. 12 (he makes intercession for the transgressors; but LXX. *ἐὰν τὰς ἀνομιὰς παρῆλθοι*), and the *Targ. Jon.* on the passage: pro peccatis deprecatus est. Comp. 2 Sam. xix. 6.

³ Kuinöl thought of the soldiers; Olsh., Neander, Schleierm. (p. 453), of Jews; Steinmeyer, pp. 186 sqq., Jews and all (propitiator). Luke may think of the Jews, Acts iii. 17. But Luke xxiii. 28? Weisse, II. p. 179, sceptical as to Luke.

tance into Paradise that same day.¹ Thus Jesus now proclaimed mercy to the criminal, as he had formerly done to the publicans. We have here a noble and novel characteristic of Christianity; indeed, more than that, a certain possession of heaven, a world-tribunal on the cross. But the other sources know only that both malefactors blasphemed. And how could the robber know anything of the innocence of Jesus or of his return as king? How could Jesus foresee that he and the malefactor would die that very day; or how could he give that Paradise which was in the hands of God, and which, though mentioned by a Jewish-Christian source and in a very similar manner by Jewish sources, Jesus himself never mentioned?²

John, on his part, instead of the mockers and malefactors, knows of the presence of the women under the cross, Mary the mother of Jesus and her sister being mentioned first, and with them the beloved disciple. Jesus, perceiving them, commits his unhappy mother to John, and John to Mary; when the earthly filial bond is snapped, the beloved disciple is to continue the

¹ Luke xxiii. 39—43. *Acta Pil.* A. and B. 9 sq., comp. *Narrat. Joseph.* (ἰφηγ. I.) 1 sqq. (Tisch. p. 436). Comp. also Langen, p. 327. On the names, comp. Thilo, p. 580; Hofm. p. 178; Lips. p. 39. Lipsius thinks the names in the Arabic *Gospel of the Childhood*, Titus and Dumachus (θεομάχος), are older. Dysmas perhaps from δνσμη, the Western, or the Dying One; Gestas, perhaps more correctly Stegas from στεγανός, taciturn, callous. Volkmar (p. 595) finds in the right and left in Luke, the left one a heathen.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 520, regards the silence of the malefactors, as in John, original. Reconciliation of the blasphemy of the malefactors (Matt., Mark) and the penitence of one of them (Luke), as early as Orig. 133: *conveniens est, ut in primis quidem ambo latr. intelligantur dom. blasphemasse, post hoc autem unum ex iis conversum.* Parallel, *Kctub.* f. 103: *quo die Rabbi moriturus erat, venit vox de cœlo dixitque: qui præsens aderit morienti Rabbi, ille intrabit in paradysum.* Further parallels, Wetst. p. 819. Paradise in the Ebionite source of Luke xvi. 19 sqq.; 2 Cor. xii. 4. Aug. *Tr.* 31 in *Joa.*: *ipsa crux tribunal fuit.* Suppositions of Paulus and Kuinöl as to the high culture of the murderers, or as to miraculous conversions, see Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 520. The great improbability of the conversation, Weissé, p. 465. Schleierm. (p. 452) makes a forced attempt to justify the mention of Paradise, suggesting that Jesus accommodated himself to Jewish conceptions. Steinm. (pp. 196 sq.) goes still further: *by me and by death thou wilt become innocent!* Gess (p. 195) says the kingdom of Jesus was believed in because of the confession before the tribunal.

filial piety of Jesus.¹ An affecting picture of genuine humanity, of noble filial care in him who on the cross might have been expected to forget heaven and earth, or at least earth. But, in fact, none of his relatives and friends stood under the cross, least of all his mother and John; Jesus never had had his mother—who was unbelieving—with him, and John was still too dependent to possess a house into which to receive her. The author, however, had no thought for these material details. His single purpose—a purpose by which the simple and affecting human character of this scene is seriously impaired—is to point out John as the genuine successor of Jesus appointed by the testament on the cross,—as the guardian of the community represented by Mary, and concerning which the historical Jesus once uttered similar words,—as the leader of the Church, superior to both Peter and James the brother of Jesus.² Lastly, the sublime final exclamations in Luke and John fall away of themselves, since the earlier Gospels know of merely a loud cry of pain. In particular the closing exclamation in Luke, which converts the death-agony into a voluntary act of the Son of God, is—contrary to Jesus' original manner—taken verbally from Ps. xxxi.; and the exclamation in John adds to Luke's "yielded up his spirit," that factually quite correct "It is finished!" which the dogmatic of the book had already placed in the mouth of Jesus, especially in the farewell addresses.³

¹ John xix. 25—27. Similar examples in the classics (Luc. *Tox.* 22: ἀπολείπω Ἀρεταίῳ τὴν μητέρα μου τρέφειν καὶ γηροκομεῖν), Wetst. p. 955; Fr. p. 154.

² Comp. above, p. 154, n. 1. Here Hase (p. 255) is not, but Renan (15th ed. p. 436) is, decidedly critical. The latter speaks of the impossibility of silence on the part of the Synoptics, and of the improbability that Jesus would be the subject of a strong family sentiment at that moment. The chief idea in the picture has been expressed by Scholten, *Joh.* p. 383. Strauss, 4th ed. p. 528 (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 380), vicarius Christi. On the other hand, Steinm. pp. 198 sqq.: dying as propitiator he has no longer a mother; John becomes son through the propitiation. The similar passage, Matt. xii. 49 (Strauss).

³ Luke xxiii. 46 (comp. Holtzm. p. 473), verbally from Ps. xxxi. 5 (LXX.), only present instead of παραθήσομαι. *Acta Pil.* B. 11, has the latter; A. 11, gives the Hebrew (corruptly) before the Greek. John xix. 30, comp. verse 28; xvii. 4. Strauss,

Returning from these fictitious amplifications to the simpler accounts of the last hours of Jesus in Matthew and Mark, we find in these latter more fidelity to history, though that fidelity is not in all points exact. Only two exclamations of Jesus are here given, and both of them placed in the last hour of his agony. The second, the death-cry, the unadorned, natural, solemnly impressive fact, may be recognized as historical, although in Matthew it does not appear to be altogether without allusion to Psalm xxii., and in Mark, by its thrilling victorious intensity, represents something miraculous. The first cry, an outburst of sorrow in distinct words, has at least a genuine nucleus.¹ The cry as given in the vernacular, "Eli, Eli, lemâh shebâktani! My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is certainly doubtful, partly because it was used by the Jews and is literally taken from Psalm xxii., which the Gospels have applied to the dying Messiah, and have evidently made use of in the actual history of the passion; and partly because the immediate response to, the erroneous or derisive interpretation of, this cry of sorrow by those who stood near, who are made to discover in it an appeal to the prophet Elijah for help, belongs plainly to the domain of myth.² Moreover, those who stood near are assumed

4th ed. p. 531, undervalues the great difference between Matt., Mark, and Luke, John. Previously, Schleierm. p. 450. Renan (15th ed. p. 440) sees in Luke, John, only a different exposition of the death-cry. Weisse, p. 466, correctly for Matt., Mark, against Luke, John; on the contrary, Bunsen (p. 416) is influenced by John to decide against the Synoptics.

¹ Death-cry, Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37, 39. Matt., by κράζας recalls Ps. xxii. 2, ὁ Θεός, κεκράζομαι πρὸς σε, and xxii. 24, ἐν τῷ κεκραγέειν με πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήκουσέ μου. The miracles, Matt. xxvii. 51 sqq., which put the foes to shame (verse 49), can be regarded (comp. Ps. xxii. 28 sqq.) as the response to his cry. In such a sense also Heb. v. 7 (comp. Luke xxiii. 46) understands the death of Jesus as the answer to his weeping and crying. Also Origen on Matt. 140. But since the text of Psalm xxii. is not actually used, the fact may first be established and then the allusion to the Psalm. In Mark, the word used in the Psalm is wanting, but it can be said that Mark has struck out this feature. The miraculous in the voice in Mark, also Volkmar, p. 600.

² Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34. Plainly already assumed in Heb. v. 7. Ps. xxii. 2 (Hebr.): eli, eli, lamah asabtani. For this verb there stands in the Gospels the Aram. shebak, shebaktani (Dan. iv. 12 sqq.). In the Targ., Bux. p. 2317: Eli, eli, methul mah shebaktani. Lemah (not lamah), Matt., Mark. Aram., Ezra iv. 22. Mark (in Matt. only B) gives Eloī (LXX. Judges v. 5), derived either from Syr. Ela(o)hi, Dan.

to have been Jews, whilst all the evidences reveal only heathen soldiers in immediate proximity to the cross, and in a special detail Luke distinctly mentions such. These Jews, again, must have very strangely misunderstood Jesus, or they must have applied his words to Elijah in a far-fetched mockery possible only to the most rigid dogmatist.¹ These objections are not refuted by the assertion that the Evangelists would not have introduced without historical support such a proof of weakness in Jesus, a proof which Luke and John so significantly and so completely keep out of sight: for if the Psalm showed the weakness, and still more the glorification, of the Messiah, why should any one keep the Psalm and the miracle of its fulfilment out of sight?²

Finding that this utterance of Jesus is thus for two reasons questionable, we may justly be surprised when we see with what confidence many have here found an established fact; and we may be still more surprised at the assurance with which representatives both of free and of orthodox tendencies have drawn conclusions from such a fact. Who can prove that, even if Jesus uttered these words, he spoke as a comfortless despairer; as one who, having with Galilean hopefulness looked for an interposition of God, for a miracle, for a Divine deliverance from the cross, now gave up his cause as lost; as one who in the face

iv. 5, or from Eloah suff. Elohi. The word is also placed in the mouth of Esther, *Bab. Megill.* f. 15, 2. Lightfoot, p. 387. Invalid objections to Matt. in Volkmar, p. 597: as he vulgarly wrote Elia instead of Eleias (but he gives Eleias), so he put Eli for eloi (but he gives Elei), and mixed up Hebr. (eli) with Aram. (shebakt) (but also *Targ. l. c.* &c., Bux. pp. 91, 2317, has Eli)! Volkmar also says that Matt. did not understand the mockery of the foes.

¹ Luke xxiii. 36 sq., comp. John xix. 29. The word Eli, or indeed Eloi (Elei) could not be mistaken by any one for Elijahu or Elijah (Greek Eleias). The Elijah-dogma, Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 10. Olshausen (p. 495) thought of dread of Elijah's return. Weisse (p. 466) in an inconceivable manner finds it possible that foreign soldiers should think of Elijah. For the rest, Weisse thinks only of a cry of extreme anguish which the soldiers made to refer to Elijah, and the disciples to Ps. xxii. Krabbe (p. 502) holds that Jesus himself thought of the Psalm. According to Bunsen (p. 416), he perhaps, after his resurrection, indicated it as his feeling when on the cross.

² In favour of the genuineness of this particular utterance, based on these grounds (as Hase, p. 256), Schenkel, p. 312. On the contrary, Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 530.

of death trembled before the Divine judgment upon the sins of his life; or at least as one who—according to the orthodox—had, as the representative of sinners, temporarily lost the grace and paternal heaven of God?¹ Wherefore this despair just now on the very threshold of death, when previously amid dishonour, and nailing, and torture, Jesus remained for long hours proud and silent? And why cannot this cry have been a mere physical outburst of the death-agony, appealing for a speedy end, for deliverance, to the omnipotent God, who was silent not to the Son but to his sufferings?² Moreover, it is unheard-of to strain an utterance which, in itself capable of several meanings, demands a freer treatment all the more because it is the repetition of a Bible passage. Briefly, we arrive at this result: if this utterance of Jesus is genuine, it is to be explained in harmony

¹ Despair, according to the Fragmentist, p. 153: the utterance cannot, without violence, be otherwise explained than as meaning that God had not helped him in his aim and purpose as he (in the spirit of Ps. cxviii. sq., comp. above, pp. 21 sq.) had hoped. Regret in the face of the mockery of the people, Renan, 15th ed. p. 437: *il se repentit de souffrir pour une race vile*. Even sense of guilt, prickings of conscience on account of human faults, errors, and distortions, Sal. Vögelin, *Predigten*, 1864, pp. 151 sqq.; comp. Pécaut, pp. 265 sqq. An obscuring of the mind, sense of divine anger, Luther (God was against him), Quenstadt (*non potuit non vi justitiæ s. eum extreme odisse*), Calvin, Olshausen; comp. Strauss, 4th ed. p. 529, Steinm. pp. 204 sqq. Comp. also Neander, p. 573 (suffering for mankind). Hofm. *Schriftb.* II. p. 308 (given over to the will of the foes of God). Hase, p. 256, Ullm. p. 130: momentary feeling. Gess, p. 196: cessation of inner consolation, obscuration of perception as to the divine purpose. Steinm. pp. 206 sqq.: expiation, God having forsaken him and delivered him up to death.

² The sense of the Gospels and of Heb. v. 7 points in this direction. This is what is tenable in the optimistic view of Paulus (*L. J.* I. ii. p. 242, already mentioned by Caspar Sagittarius, 1684, see Steinm. p. 202), and particularly Schleierm., who cannot conceive of any moment in which the relation to God would be changed or a mental disturbance occur (thus also Neander, Krabbe, Godet); hence the assumption that the verse expresses only a part of the feelings of Jesus, and that he had in view the *whole Psalm*, therefore that he also had hope in God, Schleierm. *L. J.* p. 451 (comp. *ibid.* *Christl. Gl.* II. p. 154). In the sense of the *Evangelists* (above, p. 159, n. 1), the passage means nothing else. Essentially the same view, Volkm. p. 593, except that he does not establish the genuineness, and he charges Luke and Matt.—the writers who say Jesus was born of a virgin—with having struck out or meaninglessly retained the completely human utterance. Weisse, p. 466 (as above): cry of agony extorted from him by tortured nature (and not exactly the Biblical passage). Weizs. p. 568: what is certain in the reminiscence is, that Jesus begged for death with the whole power of his faith. Similar also in Krabbe, Lange, Hofm., Gess, and Pressensé.

with the circumstances in which it was spoken, and is therefore, after Jesus' long silent heroic waiting and as the prelude to death, not the utterance of despair but of exhaustion. But it is more than probable that the words are not genuine. In truth, what is genuine is only the fact of a cry of exhaustion very natural after such sufferings, a cry which those who guarded the cross correctly understood as a cry of thirst, and which John—in this matter quite correct—has described as such. For all the Gospels report that Jesus, when hanging upon the cross, received a drink; and three of them expressly state that this happened towards the close of his life immediately after his cry of agony.¹ The cry was so heartrending that one of the soldiers—as Luke correctly gives it—hastily filled a sponge with water and vinegar, that is with the *posca*, the drink of the Roman soldiers, and putting it upon a reed (a hyssop-stalk according to John) gave it to Jesus to drink, who did not this time refuse it.²

Thus what we know of the crucified is confined to the two probable facts, that shortly before his death he uttered a cry of lamentation, and when on the point of dying a death-cry. This is little, yet it is enough. We can understand the sad silence and the cry of lamentation when we remember the intensity of the pain with which his body was racked. The lips of ancient orators and modern medical art have attempted to describe the torture of the cross: the transfixing of the limbs through

¹ Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34; John xix. 28. Comp. Luke xxiii. 36. Number of times drink was offered, Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 515. Ridiculous remark on the love of his enemies in Jesus' entreaty for drink, Steinm. p. 213.

² *Militaris cibus*, Lampr. *Ser.* 51. *Cœnula* (cibus, vinum), Petron. 111. The *posca* (pusca, from πῶς), see Spart. *Hadr.* 10: *Cibi castrenses*, *laridum* (the fat of pork), *caseus et posca*. This identical with vinegar, Gallic. *Cass.* 5: *præter laridum ac buccellatum* (biscuit) *atque acetum* militem in expedit. portare prohibuit. Ulp. *De erog. mil. annon.*: *vinum atque acetum* milites nostri solent percipere, uno die vinum, alio die acetum. Comp. Veget. *De art. veter.* 2, 48: *spongia cum posca acri*. Suet. *Vitell.* 12: *posca u vendentem*. Pliny, *H. N.* 27, 12, comp. Wetst. p. 535. The hyssop of John appears to be not devoid of symbolic purpose: bunches of hyssop were favourite instruments used in the holy sprinklings (Ex. xii. 22; Lev. xiv. 4; Heb. ix. 19; Barn. 8, &c.), and the purifying power of the blood of the cross is John's favourite idea. Therefore what was given to him, that he much more distributed, John xix. 34.

bundles of irritable nerves and tendons ; the increasing inflammation of the severely wounded parts exposed after brief hemorrhage to the air and the sun ; the acute pain of the unnatural and rigid extension of the body ; the stinging smart in all the wounded members on every slightest movement ; and most of all, the terrible checking of the flow of the blood in the wounded limbs, in the stiffened hands and feet and in the updrawn arms, and consequently the oppressive and painful congestion of blood in the noble organs of the heart and brain ; and in all this feverishness, in all this sense of oppression, in all this exhaustion, perhaps no protection from the sky and nothing from men except the continuous scorn and the once-given vinegar-water.¹ As with reference to Gethsemane, so also here it has been said that others have endured the same and greater sufferings ; Christian martyrs, on the rack, on the cross, in the fire, have judged their foes, comforted their friends, praised God in loud and jubilant tones, and boasted of their hopes. It may be so ; but instead of allowing ourselves to be perplexed by the gloomy silence of the sufferer, we can with satisfaction say : “ God be praised, he was no superhuman prodigy, he was a man ; and in the terrible catastrophe, he was no intemperate enthusiast, he was a sage.”² Not merely a sage, he was a sage even in his silence, and because he kept silence. Ancient prophecy had described the Servant of God who was dumb as the sheep at the shambles ; and New Testament authors are factually and historically correct in finding in this very silence the nobility—nay, the sufficing sacrificial offering—of the death of Jesus, whilst at the same time they have by his cry and his tears

¹ Cic. *Ferr.* 5, 6 : cruciatus et crux. Cic. *Pison.* 18 : si te et Gabinium cruci suffixos viderem, majore afficerer lætitia ex corporis vestri laceratione quam afficior ex famæ. Sen. *V. Beat.* 19 : crucibus distrahuntur. *Ep.* 101 : monstrosus, distortus, jam debilis, jam pravus, &c. Chr. G. Richter, *Dissert. IV. medicæ*, Gott. 1775. Paulus, pp. 781 sqq. Friedl. p. 155.

² Comp. the histories of the martyrs, particularly the persecution of the church at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius, and the heroine Blandina, Eus, 5, 1 ; above, p. 20, n. 1. Marc. Aurelius's charge, above, p. 93, n. 3.

convinced themselves of his genuine humanity.¹ It would be to do Jesus an injustice to compare him with the crucified who, though some of them were stern warriors, clamoured loudly when being led forth, stood weeping or calling for help under the cross, and when on the cross sobbed—nay, in the distraction of their pain made disclosures, cursed, railed against, and spat upon their accusers and judges and those that were looking on, or, when all proved futile, begged that at least they might be granted a burial.² That to the end he was silent in his agony, before his judges and his revilers, and that he silently accepted his terrible divinely-appointed destiny, is the sign of a royal man who, in spite of the harshness and the cruel contradiction of his fate, was strong to walk in that way which his mind and will had long since acknowledged to be inevitable, a severe but wise dispensation of God. He could complain, but that would be to murmur; he could censure, but that would not be to sacrifice himself; he could recant and descend from the cross, but that would be to repudiate his Messiahship. He suffered, and though it was against nature, yet it was his vocation to do so. He suffered, believing that God willed it, purposing to atone by his blood, sure of giving to his own the last promised farewell gift, hoping that it was only his body and not his soul which he was sacrificing, but that he would ascend from his cross to the heaven of God, to the final Messiahship. This is the golden substance of his silence, the golden sermon without words. Like himself, many, in particular many of his Jewish fellow-countrymen, had already died, with

¹ Isaiah liii. 7; Rom. v. 6—19, xv. 3; 1 Peter ii. 23; Heb. ii. 10 sqq., v. 7.

² Cic. *Ferr.* 5, 62: civis Rom. sum (Gavius when scourged). 5, 46: gemitus. *Bar. Mez.* f. 83, 2, in Bux. p. 686: stabat sub patib. et flebat. Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 4 (the hero Eleazar at Machærus): ἐκέλευεν αὐτοὺς (θάνατον τ. οἰκτιστον). *Ib.* 4, 6, 1 (the warrior Niger of Peræa, when dragged to his death, cried out, showed his wounds, and at last begged for burial). Cic. *Cluën.* 66: ne condemnaretur extrema servuli voce morientis. Just. 22, 7: adeo ut (Bomilcar) de summa cruce veluti de tribunali in Pœnorum scelera concionaretur, etc. Hæc cum in max. populi concione vociferatus esset, expiravit. Jos. *B. J.* 4, 6, 1: ἀναρνούμενος τιμωροὺς Ῥωμαίους ἐπηράσατο. Sen. *V. Beat.* 19: crederem, nisi quidam ex patibulo suo spectatores conspuerent.

noble confessions or with sublime silence, in their Jewish tenacity of conviction.¹ But such a combination of conviction, performance, vocation, and destiny, had never occurred. In his unfathomable profundity, the man of idealism stands on the height of his Messiahship without a parallel in word and deed; and mankind loves him who thus died for it, and thanks Pilate that, instead of contemptuously acquitting Jesus or procuring for him a private death within the walls of Cæsarea, he permitted him to die publicly in the presence of the people, apparently so dishonourably, but in reality so grandly. He who, with Celsus, sees on the cross one who whines or doubts, disowns not only the truth but ostensible fact.²

But looking from the silent cross to the silent heaven, is it then necessary to give up the belief which was the belief of Jesus, and remains the belief of Christians so long as they do not relinquish the pearl of their religion,—the belief, namely, that no creature falls to the earth, that no hair is destroyed, without the God of heaven? Or has the Divine Majesty really executed his providential purpose as a stern judge and denier of what was finite, temporary, impure in the person of Jesus and in his early work, in his terrestrial Messiahship, in his over-bold divine Sonship? Verily, nowhere in the world's history does the enigma of Providence stand before us in such gigantic proportions as in the divine permission of the cruel death of the man at whose hands God received back his world, his human race. And though God needed no sin-offering, though it cannot be that God permitted the discoverer of eternal truth to make expiation for his representation of the truth, does it after all remain the fact that, either by non-interference or from a want of power,

¹ Of the crucified Bomilear, Justin says, 22, 7: sed B. magno animo crudelitatem civium tulit: adeo ut (see previous note). With reference to the adherents of Judas the Galilean, Josephus says in Ant. 18, 1, 6: *θανάτων τε ἰδέας ὑπομένειν πολλὰ λαμβάνοντας ἐν ὀλίγῳ τίθενται*. So the Essenes and Pharisees (*B.J.* 2, 8, 10; *Ant.* 18, 1, 3; above, I. p. 372, IV. p. 280); we may recall the cry of the dying Rabbi Akiba: "Echad! One God!" Tac. *Hist.* 5, 5, of the Jews in general: moriendi contemptus.

² Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 34.

He allowed as free a play here as elsewhere to the course of the world, and to the liberty and the sinfulness of men? But no; we can find light in the heavens without seeking the aid of the comfortless resignation which Spinoza, instead of Jesus imposes upon the modern world; we can find light in the thoughts suggested to us by the Gospels and Epistles. Because it was God's will to make the hero of our faith spiritually and morally perfect, and to bind mankind for ever to his person by repentance and love, therefore God delivered him up, and forbade angels and men to save him from the cross.¹

3.—*The Peace of Death.*

The noble and patient sufferer soon reached his goal. The Gospels agree in the statement that Jesus died before sunset, before the commencement of the Sabbath, before six o'clock in the evening, and, according to all the evidences, considerably earlier than that. Indeed, the three older Gospels give the time yet more exactly; they mention the ninth hour, that is between three and four in the afternoon.² There are, however, here several difficulties. John does not give the hour, and postpones the pronouncing of the sentence as late as noon. Again, the other Gospels, which in this part are manifoldly mythical, perhaps had in mind an unmentioned comparison when they stated the hour.³ Moreover, death on the same evening would

¹ Matt. xx. 28; John xv. 13; Rom. v. 6 sqq.; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. ii. 5; 1 Peter ii. 21; Heb. ii. 10; Acts ii. 28, iii. 13 sqq.

² The new day, therefore also the Sabbath, began with the sunset, see Jos. *B.J.* 4, 5, 2, and the interesting communication concerning the bigoted Jewish pilot, Synes. *Ep.* 4, 163 (Petav.). Hence also the burial of those who had been executed *πρὸ ἑνντος ἡλίου*, Jos. *l.c.* All the Gospels point to a considerable interval between the death and the burial, which latter took place at close upon six o'clock, Matt. xxvii. 46, 50, 57; Mark xv. 34, 37, 42; Luke xxiii. 44—54; John xix. 30 sq., 38. The ninth hour is most definitely pointed to by Luke xxiii. 44—46 as the hour of death. But Matt. (comp. Mark xv. 37) does not think of any long interval between verses 46 and 50 (the tenth hour, perhaps, instead of the ninth), as might seem, and in many respects might be assumed; on the contrary, his purpose is to show the speedy divine help in contrast to the mocking at the Eli-cry.

³ John xix. 14, 30; Matt. xxvii. 45, 50.

be very early, almost too early after only a six-hours' crucifixion, if we accept the time when the crucifixion is said by Mark to have commenced, or indeed after a three-hours' crucifixion, if, with Origen, we adopt the time of the commencement given by John and the time of the end given by the Synoptics.¹ Yet these differences have little weight against the unassailable fact that death occurred on the day of execution, at the latest between five and six o'clock in the evening. John need cause us no anxiety; it is evident that he has placed the sentence at noon in order, in a striking though unhistorical way, to make it synchronize with the Jewish preparation for the sacrifice of the Passover lamb, the typical relation of which to Jesus this author so energetically insists upon. He does not deny that the death occurred between three and four; on the contrary, by his mention of the Sabbath preparation (3—6 p.m.) he assumes it, and in his subtle manner at the very beginning of his Gospel alludes to it, one might almost say with some timidity, because he ventured to curtail the hours of the sufferings of the Son of God to the briefest and hardly credible duration.² We cannot suspect the earlier Gospels of purposely making the death of Jesus synchronize with the time of the evening temple sacrifice, of the offering up of the lamb at the ninth hour, for they contain no tangible allusion to such a relation. But the suspicion to which these Gospels are most obnoxious is that, with their numbers, with their sixth and their ninth hours, which are mentioned in connection with the darkness and not immediately with the death of Jesus, they have given only a measure of the

¹ Origen on Matt. V. 140: *miraculum, quoniam post tres horas receptus est.*

² Preparation of the Sabbath, John xix. 31, 42. Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 16, 6, 2: *παρασκ. ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐννιάτης*. Notice also the tenth hour in John i. 35, 39 (first significant visit of two disciples, especially of John, the witness of the death (xix. 35), to the Lamb of God). The sixth and seventh hours (iv. 6, 52) may also refer to the time of Jesus' passion. From noon until three (four) as the time of the passion suits John excellently well, (1) on account of the Passover lamb, which was made ready about noon and slain about three; (2) on account of the Synoptics, who place the severest struggle of Jesus in these very hours; and (3) it accords with the aim of abbreviating the passion of the Son of God, an abbreviation which is of great importance to John with his Docetic tendency (Mark xv. 44 already betrays a similar point of view).

duration of that—in itself very uncertain—darkness, borrowed from the Old Testament and the traditions of the Jews.¹ Though it follows from the above that the hour of Jesus' death cannot be absolutely fixed, the whole of the reports perfectly agree in asserting that the end came to Jesus before the close of the day, before the commencement of the Sabbath, which began at six o'clock in the evening, and that he immediately afterwards found the rest of the grave.

So speedy a death was certainly a seldom occurrence. When there was not sooner or later some—often purchased—violence used, by either sword, lance, or hammer, by stabbing and crushing, by fire and smoke, the crucified often lived twenty-four or thirty-six hours, sometimes three days and nights; and those that were crucified head-downwards are said to have died simply of hunger or exhaustion, being sometimes intentionally kept alive, and the fatal blow withheld out of cruelty.²

¹ We might think of the evening sacrifice: *περὶ ἑννάτην ὥραν*, *Jos. Ant.* 14, 4, 3. But the Synoptics, not even Mark, take no notice of the corresponding morning sacrifice (above, p. 63); and the evening sacrifice would in reality symbolize only the beginning, and not the result, of the crucifixion, which would then be postponed to three o'clock. But a stronger objection is found in the fact that the mention of noon and three o'clock refers primarily to the (unhistorical) darkness, and that these hours are supported by the Old Testament (the sun in the meridian 12 o'clock, and beginning of the evening three o'clock or the ninth hour. *Jos. B. J.* 6, 9, 3); see the miracles at the death, below. p. 172. Volkmar, p. 592, thinks the numbers signify merely: the day through on the cross!

² Seneca speaks of protracted duration, in obedience to Mæcenas' wish, *Sen. Ep.* 101: *hanc (vitam) mihi, vel acuta si sedeam cruce, sustine. Diu mori, trahere animam.* More frequently a confector interposed, *Tert. Ap.* 21; *Eus.* 4, 15; see below, burial, and *John* xix. 31. Purchase of death, *Cic. Verr.* 2, 45. Also the detractio ex cruce, *Cic. Quint.* 1, 2, 2, and *Jos. Vita*, 75, point to a long conservation of life. Origen, on *Matt.* 140, says expressly: *vivunt (qui non percutiuntur post fixationem) c. plur. cruciati aliquando autem et tota nocte et adhuc post eam tota die.*—*Sperabatur diu pendens in cruce majora pati tormenta.*—*Miraculum, quoniam post 3 horas receptus est, qui forte biduum victurus erat in cruce sec. consuetud. eorum, qui suspenduntur, non percutiuntur.* Those who were crucified head-downwards and yet died of hunger, *Eus. H. E.* 8, 8: *οἱ χειρόνως ἀνάπαλιν κατωκάρα προσηλωθέντες, τηρούμενοί τε ζῶντες, εἰς ὅτε καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἰκρίων λιμὴ διαφθαρείεν.* *Comp. Friedl.* p. 161. Recent cases: a Mameluke, in 1247, Wednesday noon until Sunday noon. *Kosegarten, Chrest. Arab.* pp. 63 sqq.; the crucified in Sudan, usually three days, *Langen*, p. 354. On romantic modern crucifixions, see below on apparent death. Very reasonable against the fixed rule, *Schleierm.* pp. 445 sq.

Thus the two murderers survived Jesus. Naturally there can here be no fixed rule laid down, since the power of resistance and the amount of injury inflicted varied; and while there are credible instances of sufferers living four, and less credible ones of others living ten, days on the cross, another sufferer might succumb in one day. By Roman authors one day is expressly mentioned; and later, Origen, who had abundant opportunity of knowing, regards thirty-six hours as the maximum.¹ An only six, or at most eight, hours' suffering certainly does not remind us of the more delicate constitution of Jesus, about which we know nothing; nor does it directly suggest to us, as it did to the Fathers, a miracle wrought by God or by the Son himself, who delivered himself from the torture which he only tasted, and did not endure unto the end. Least of all are we, with Steinmeyer, led to think of the sinlessness of Jesus, which this critic holds rendered Jesus liable to succumb earlier to the violence to which he was subjected. If it was possible for Jesus to die under the hands of his scourgers, it is quite conceivable that, after a night and a day full of alarm and ill-treatment, full of bodily and yet more of mental suffering, and all this at the close of a week of agitation, disappointment, and farewells, his strength should suddenly break down, though not without a spasmodic last cry of distress.² But as this loud final cry seems to point less to general exhaustion than to an altogether

¹ Petron. *Sat.* 111: imperator prov. latrones jussit crucibus affigi. *Proxima ergo nocte* cum miles, qui cruces servabat, ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraberet. Similarly Just. 22, 7 (Bomilcar): hæc vociferatus etc. expiravit. Comp. Origen, *l.c.*, aliquando, forte biduum. Eus. 8, 8: *ἡτοιμαμένοι ζῶντες*. The four days, see previous note; the ten days (in *Act. Sanct.*, Timoth. and Maura), in Langen, p. 354.

² Delicacy, Hase, p. 79. On the other hand, Schleier. p. 445. Sinlessness, Steinm. p. 184, with weak polemic against Schl. The miracle already in the Gospels and Heb. v. 7. Tert. *Ap.* 21: suffixus spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit, prævento carnificis officio. Origen on Matt. 140: oravit patrem et exauditus est et statim ut clamavit ad p., receptus est aut posuit animam, quando voluit ipse. Miraculum enim erat, quoniam post 3 horas receptus est, etc.: ut videretur beneficium Dei fuisse, quod expiravit et meritum orationis ejus magis quam violentia crucis. Grotius still believed in a divine hastening of death; and even physicians like G. G. Richter, 1757, assumed a voluntary death; Paulus, III. ii. pp. 781 sqq.

unexpected catastrophe, there is nothing in the way of the assumption that it was in consequence, not of a sudden heart-break, which at his age was most improbable, but of congestion, caused by paralysis of the heart or by a sudden rupture of the blood-vessels of the heart or of the head, that Jesus found the rest of death that to the outward view nature, but to faith the Father, granted to the patiently enduring Son.¹

Thus far go the historical notices of this death. But to faith such a death was too trivial, although that faith could see the commonplace character and the dishonour of this death removed by the secret connection between the suffering, pleading Son and the hearing Father, and by Jesus's calm anticipation of his resurrection from the grave. Yet not for a moment could the death of the Messiah be allowed to appear as the death of an ordinary man, of a criminal. If men did not shudder at and mourn over the terrible deed committed under the sanction of the common practice, then God must mourn; and He must not merely mourn over an occurrence which He had in fact Himself ordained, but He must at the same time bring the victorious fruit of this sanguinary work under the eyes of men. A sorrow seized upon God's mute creation, the sympathy of which Cicero asked for when men kept silence at the crucifixion of Gavius, and the tears of which Eusebius the historian vouches for in the Christian persecutions of his time. The temple upon which this Messiahship was so helplessly, so derisively, dashed to pieces, must become the trophy; and behind the wonders of God, in the triumphal march of the Messiah, must walk subdued or put to shame the men who denied and put to death the Messiah. These are sublime pictures, the outlines of which the

¹ Heart-break, the Englishmen Stroud, Hanna, as well as Friedl., Sepp, Ewald; on the other hand, with appeal to medical authorities, who admit heart-break by strong mental excitement only in case of organic heart-disease or advanced age, Langen, pp. 347 sqq. Renan, 15th ed. p. 440: rupture of a vessel in the region of the heart. Also Casp. p. 200: rupture of a heart-vessel or artery. Langen himself, p. 349, as formerly Paulus and Friedl.: exhaustion. The loud voice, notwithstanding exhaustion, explained by Gruner as caused by anxietas, Paul. p. 782.

Gospels have drawn; we honour them when we understand the meaning without anxiety as to the letter.¹

The letter of these narratives is in fact lost as soon as we discover that the earliest witness, Paul, in reality also the whole New Testament, found near the cross only sorrow and humiliation, and that a strong reaction followed upon the resurrection. Indeed, we soon perceive that many of the points of view of the New Testament not only do not presuppose, but they even exclude, the most important of these phenomena. Finally, the complete failure of these celestial miracles to influence at all the heads of the people and the people themselves, is a convincing proof of their non-historical character.²

Confidence in the details also of these narrations rapidly diminishes when we perceive the great difference particularly between John and the earlier sources; though it must be admitted that, apart from John, the earlier sources are unanimous concerning two great signs. One is the sign of mourning: from

¹ Not merely has the specific criticism of Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 534 sqq. (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II. pp. 381 sqq.), and Renan (who is silent), but the moderate criticism of recent writers has also, here given up all or most; whilst formerly Paulus, Kuinöl, looked for natural explanations. Thus in particular Ewald, Schenkel, Weizs. (both of whom are silent), Bunsen (p. 416: literally understood, it would be nonsense), and even Bleek. Schleier. and Hase are divided between criticism and rationalism (natural darkness and symbolical poetry of the veil and the risen from the dead). Most conservative, Neander, Weisse (with non-miraculous prodigies, which had a significance to the believers), Meyer, Pressensé, and now Steinm. pp. 218 sqq. Quite customary, from Paulus to Neander, Olshausen, and in part Hase ("as it were mourning in sympathy with its greatest Son"), the sympathy of nature (comp. Hosea iv. 3; Jer. iv. 28; Luke xix. 40; Rom. viii. 22). Thus already Clem. *Recogn.* 1, 41: denique cum pateretur, omnis ei compassus est mundus, &c.; and now also Baumgarten (*Gesch. Jesu*, p. 401). According to Steinm. p. 220, these are only poetico-romantic conceits. Comp. Cic. *Verr.* 5, 67: denique si non ad homines, verum ad bestias, aut etiam, si in aliqua desertissima solitudine ad saxa et ad scopulos hæc conqueri et deplorare vellem: tamen omnia muta atque inanima tanta et tam indigna rerum atrocitate commoverentur. Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 9: ἐακρῶσαι τ. γῆν ἀπὸ ῥήτωρ λόγῳ, λίθους κ. τῆν ἄψυχον ἔλθιν ἐπικλαῦσαι τοῖς γεγενημένοις. Comp. also the legends of the death of Methuselah, at which the animals wept, Heidenh. *Zeitschr.* 1869, p. 214.

² Comp. as to the first, 1 Cor. xv. 3 sqq.; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Rom. i. 4, xiv. 9; Phil. ii. 6 sqq. As to the second, comp. the rent veil with Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, see below, p. 176; the resurrection of the dead with 1 Cor. xv. 12, 23. As to the third, see below, p. 183.

the sixth until the ninth hour, from noon until the decline of day and the hour of death, the whole land, more correctly the whole earth, was covered with darkness.¹ This sign can be better explained from the standpoint of tradition than the eclipse of the sun at the death of Cæsar, or of Augustus, or of a president of the Sanhedrim who was buried with insufficient honour; for here a much greater died, one who was truly himself a setting sun; and, according to the Old Testament, such a darkness or eclipse of the sun at midday was the appointed harbinger alike of the day of judgment and of the day of the Messiah. Yet this sign, literally understood, gave the early Christians a great deal of trouble.² Ancient testimonies of other authors and nations were sought for but not found. Tertullian referred with the assurance of a connoisseur to the Roman archives, that is, probably to the genuine report of Pilate. Julius Africanus eagerly seized upon the report of the heathen historian Thallus. Origen, with others, preferred that of the chronicler Philegon of Tralles in the second century, of an obscuration (eclipse) of the sun—which never occurred to such a degree—in the 202nd Olympiad, about the time of the death of Jesus, when in the sixth hour of the day the stars appeared, and at the same time an earthquake almost entirely destroyed the town of Nicæa in Bithynia. But without asking whether this darkness occurred in the year of Jesus's death (according to Kepler and Wurm, it

¹ Matt. xxvii. 45; Luke xxiii. 44; Mark xv. 33. Πᾶσα (or Luke, Mark, ὅλη) ἡ γῆ, according to most recent critics, has a universal meaning, the whole earth (Origen, Erasmus, Luther, to Olsh. and Steinm., give it a narrower meaning, the country, as Origen, 134, says: tantummodo super omnem terram judæam aut certe super Jerus. tantum), Bleek, II. p. 471. Meyer, p. 538. *Acta Pil.* A. 10, only ἐπὶ τ. γῆν. "Ἀπασα in B.; ὅλη ἡ οἰκουμένη in *Anaphora Pil.* 7.

² Cæsar, Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 463—468. Augustus, Dio C. 56, 29: ὁ τε γὰρ ἡλιος πᾶς ἐξέλιπε. *Succ.* f. 29, 1: quatuor de causis sol deficit, prima, ob patrem domus judicii (ab bet din) mortuum, cui exequiæ non fiunt ut decet, &c. Wetstein, p. 539. The setting sun, Rabbi Bechai: cum insignis Rabbinus fato concederet, dixit quidam: dies iste gravis est Israeli, ut cum sol occidit ipso meridie, *ib.* Old Testament: Joel ii. 10, 31, iii. 15; Amos viii. 9; Is. xlii. 10, l. 3; Job ix. 7, &c. Comp. Acts ii. 19. At noon, Amos viii. 9; Jer. xv. 9. R. Bechai, above, and particularly *Succ.* l. c.: tradid. Rabb., quo temp. sol eclipsin patitur, signum malum est toti mundo; si deficit *meridie*, sign. mal. est toti mundo. Tert. *Ap.* 21: medium orbem signante sole.

was the total eclipse of the sun in the East on Nov. 24, A.D. 29, and the greatest darkness was at about eleven in the morning), we know that an eclipse of the sun at Easter-tide, at the time of the full moon, was an impossibility, notwithstanding the Evangelist Luke. When the reliance which Julius Africanus placed upon an "extraordinary eclipse of the sun" was destroyed, nothing remained to Origen and his successors, in order to save Christianity from the ridicule of educated opponents and the doubts of its friends, but to limit the darkness to Palestine and Jerusalem, and, having improved the text of Luke by means of that of Matthew and Mark, to refer the darkness, not to anything directly connected with the sun or the moon, but to vapours and clouds produced in either a natural or a supernatural way, as if it was even possible for clouds to cause a sudden and total darkness, a darkness over the whole country and the earth.¹

¹ Tert. *Ap.* 21. Here the archives are appealed to: et tamen eum mundi casum relatum in arcanis vestris habetis. We find in Tert. an appeal (1) to the *Acta Pilati* (deliquium utique putaverunt, as *A. Pil.* A. and B. 11); (2) to an *Anaph. Pil.*, which, however, is not identical with that in Tisch. pp. 413 sqq., since this latter is much later (Lips. p. 16, against Nikolas), but nevertheless gives a feature which is preserved by Tert. (Tisch. p. 417),—a fresh evidence against the radical criticism of Scholten-Lipsius. Thallus, in the third book of his Histories; Phlegon, in the thirteenth of his Chronicles. Comp. Jul. Africanus, ap. *Georg. Sync. Chronogr. ed. Nieb. Dind.* I. pp. 610, 614. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 33, 59 (comp. 2, 14). *Ib.* on Matt. V. 134. Extract from Phlegon, in Eusebius (Jerome), *Chron. ad Olymp.* 202, ed. A. Schöne, 1866, pp. 148 sq.; *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 412. See below on the chronology. Among recent writers, Paulus, pp. 765 sqq. Wurm in Bengel's *Archiv.* II. p. 304; Neander, p. 574; Wies. *Chronolog. Synopse*, pp. 387 sq.; Friedl. p. 158, who still relies upon Thallus and Phlegon, as do also Krabbe, p. 504, and Langen, p. 344. Exceedingly interesting are Julius Africanus' remarks upon both; and still more those of Origen, who, *Con. Cels.*, is inclined to rely upon Phlegon, but in writing upon Matthew recognizes the untenableness of this combination, and with some prolixity shows the naturalistic exposition of the opponents (ordinary eclipse of the sun, as the Jews in the *Acta Pil.* 11, comp. Tert. *Ap.* 21, also say: ἐκλειψις κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς), still more their ridicule of the fact, which was nowhere reported and was excluded by the full moon (eum luna esset plena et plenitudinem solis haberet!), and also the difficulty in which the faithful found themselves. He then points out the untenableness of the explanation given by Julius Africanus, and adopts the explanation given above. Here interested textual criticism comes into play. Whilst in Luke xxiii. 45, the oldest reading (Sin., Vat., Ephr., Reg., comp. now also Tisch.) gives an eclipse of the sun (τ. ἡλ. ἐκλιπώντος), a reading which the passage itself requires (thus also Tisch.), Origen, though he repeatedly recognizes this reading, when writing upon Matt. ascribes it to the insidiatōres ecclesiæ, and reads with our Rec.: κ. ἐσκορίσθη (without a real eclipse of the sun)

The second is a grand sign of triumph. At the moment of the death of Jesus, according to Luke before the death, during the darkness between the sixth and the ninth hours, the veil of the temple, more exactly the inner curtain between the Holy place and the Holy of Holies, was rent in two from top to bottom.¹ According to the Gospel of the Hebrews, the colossal lintel of the temple was broken.² This latter amplification shows at any rate how this catastrophe is to be interpreted; and the Clementines, in the middle of the second century, and Eusebius and his successors in the fourth, have similarly interpreted the rending of the veil: the sign signified neither the completion of the highest act of propitiation by Jesus the true High-priest, nor his or the Christians' access into the Holy of Holies of God; but it symbolized the end of the temple and of the temple service, whose abolition and destruction Jesus had announced, and whose non-destruction had been made the subject of a mocking cry to the powerless Messiah on the cross.³ If there still remains any doubt

ὁ ἥλιος (as σκότος in Matt., Mark). Thus he came to the tenebrosissimæ nubes concurrentes super terram judæam et Jerus. ad cooperiendos radios solis. Thus also recent writers. Schleierm. p. 448: temporary atmospheric condition, such as has often been experienced (comp. Paulus, p. 765). Hase, p. 279: vapours with earthquake, not merely mythical. Similarly Paulus, Kuinöl, Neander. Weisse, p. 465: natural occurrence, perhaps painted somewhat blacker by the fancy of the disciples. But not mythical! Langen, p. 344, lacks clearness. Steinmeyer, p. 221: miraculous symbolical operation of the power of God.

¹ Matt. xxvii. 51; Luke xxiii. 45; Mark xv. 38 (Matt. and Mark alike; Luke only μέσον). Καταπέτασμα, instead of κάλυμμα, the usual word for the inner curtain in the Septuagint and Philo; see Bleek, II. p. 475 (against Hug); also Grimm, sub v. Differently, Steinm. p. 223.

² Jerome upon the passage: in ev., cujus sæpe fecimus mentionem, superliminare templi infinitæ magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum (*Ep.* 120 *ad Hedib.*: corruiisse) legimus; comp. Is. vi. 4. See Hilgenfeld, *Hebr.-Ev.* IV. pp. 17, 28. Comp. Paulus, III. i. p. 148. This report is not more mythical (Meyer) than that of Matthew.

³ This sign is very generally explained, not so much as indicating the abolition of the temple or of the Old Testament, as symbolizing the removal of the veil between the God of the Old Testament and man, the opening of access to God by the sacrifice of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 13 sqq.; Heb. vi. 19 sqq., ix. 3, 7 sqq., x. 19 sqq.). Thus Paulus, Schleierm., Neander, Krabbe, Steinm., Strauss, Volkmar; and Hilg. *Zeits.* 1868, p. 71, who finds a factual difference between the Gospel of the Hebrews and Matthew. But have we not here rather two different forms of one conception? Is not the opening of the Holy of Holies a laying bare, a profaning? And how can we introduce into the

upon this subject, in spite of the ancient testimonies and the clear standpoint of the Evangelists, it must be removed by these eloquent prognostics—in part already referred to by Eusebius—which are said to have been observed in the temple at Jerusalem in the beginning of the last war with the Romans. At Easter, A.D. 66, about midnight, the heavy brazen eastern gate of the temple, which could with difficulty be moved by many men, flew open of itself. Many saw in this a token that the gate of prosperity was opened to Israel; but men of understanding and learning took it to signify the surrender of the temple to the Romans, its destruction. This meaning became yet more evident when, at Pentecost of the same year, the priests who had charge of the temple at night heard the cry, as if uttered by a great multitude, "Let us remove hence!"¹ But explain these things as we may, the rending of the veil in itself demands a literal or a rationalistic interpretation far less than does the darkness; it demands a spiritual interpretation.² The important point is, not that it

Synoptics, into Matthew, the conception of the Epistle of the Hebrews, which is entirely foreign to them? Who does not think of Matt. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40? The most important circumstance is that the ancients thus interpreted. Jerome has given the correct meaning of the narrative of the Gospel of the Hebrews, *Ep. 18 ad Damas.*: quod autem sublatum est superliminare et domus impleta est fumo (comp. Is. vi. 4) signum est templi judaici destruendi et incendendæ univ. Jerus. Hilg. *N.T.* p. 28. But our Gospel narrative is also thus interpreted, Clem. *Recogn.* 1, 41: velum templi scissum est, velut lamentans excidium loco imminens. So also Aug. and Theophyl., Steinm. p. 224. Comp. *Anaph. Pil. A.* 7 (invisibility of the Holy of Holies in the darkness). Also Eus. (Hier.) *Chron. l.c.* pp. 148 sq., introduces, among the signs of the death of Jesus, the story of Josephus about the departure of God from the temple, a parallel which can apply only to our Gospel passage. On the other hand, Origen, upon Matthew, has—which we can easily understand in an Alexandrian—nearly the modern interpretation (138): velum templum interiora templi velabat, . . . ut per mortem Chr. destruentis credentium mortem possint adspicere quæ sunt intra velum.

¹ Jos. *B.J.* 6, 5, 3. Hug and Neander (p. 575) appeal to the Talmud, according to which this was forty years before the destruction! Eus., Jerome, *l.c.*, mention only the Pentecost cry: μεταβαίνωμεν ἐντιῦθιν, whilst the Easter story lay much nearer. Both combined, Tac. *H.* 5, 13. How conscientious are these Fathers when they place these incidents κατὰ (Jerome, however, circa) τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους with the death of Jesus. Neander, p. 575, and Krabbe, p. 505, are still disposed to believe these stories.

² Thus also Schleierm., Bleek, Hase, Strauss, and others. Even Neander, p. 574: if it is true! Some foundation of fact to which *myth* has attached itself! On the other hand, very remarkably, Weisse, p. 465: no mythical impress! Meyer thinks

happened, but that it was believed. For who saw, and what Jewish, nay what other Christian, source has reported it? ¹ The Gospel of the Hebrews has a different report, and Paul and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews know nothing of a sign which would have brilliantly proved to *them* the end of the old in the new, and would according to common consent have crowned the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. ² Indeed, a comparison of Mark with Matthew and Luke would suggest that there had existed a narrative of the death of Jesus in which the temple sign was altogether wanting. ³

Two other signs are mentioned, one by Matthew and the other by John. Closely connected with the sign of the temple is that of the blood and water, which John on his own responsibility substitutes for the former. Having, immediately after the death of Jesus, introduced a breaking of the limbs of the still living robbers and an incidental lance-thrust in the side of Jesus, details which themselves had to be established, he finds—to say nothing of the trivial fulfilments of the Old Testament which he here brings in—in the blood and water that streamed from the wounded side a most mysterious sign, established by appeal to John's ocular testimony, of the miraculous effects of this death. ⁴ Here the orthodox usually look for the miracle in the wrong place. Not to speak of the rationalists who find here a sure sign

the same, more particularly because no prophecy and no national Jewish belief explain it. Paulus's explanation (p. 795) of the rending of the veil—which was stretched tight both at the side and below—in consequence of the natural shaking of the earth (of which only Matt. speaks), or Kuinöl's suggestion of the rottenness of the veil (Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 537), and the refutations of these explanations (Krabbe, p. 505), have only an historical interest. The curtains would not be rotten, since they (Wetst. p. 540) were often renewed. For the rest, even Paulus was on the way to see in the narrative a symbolical fable based upon the Epistle to the Hebrews.

¹ Thus Schleierm. pp. 448 sq.

² 2 Cor. iii. 7 sqq., &c.; and Heb., see above, p. 174, n. 3.

³ Who does not have the impression that Mark xv. 38 is an interpolation from Matt. The ἐξέπνευσε in verse 37 is naturally followed by verse 39. Has Mark here followed a simpler source, or has he on his own responsibility supplanted the material miracle by a more spiritual one?

⁴ John xix. 31 sqq. Comp. John ii. 19 with Matt. xxvi. 61. Also above, I. p. 213.

of death, the end of the miracle, the orthodox discover, in the fact of the mobility of the blood which still flows out of the corpse, the superiority of the latter to death and corruption, therefore the presage of the resurrection, or plainly the divinity of Jesus.¹ But what has the water to do with this, and what is in truth the meaning of the sign of blood and water in this Gospel? Blood and water is the symbol of the Spirit which flows forth from Jesus the dead, the glorified, inasmuch as from the duality of his actions, his baptism of water and his baptism of blood, a new and higher life passes into humanity, a life unknown to Judaism and to the dispensation of the temple.² Thus to the negative effects of this death are here added the positive, to the darkness light, to the dissolution of the temple the higher temple structure. Hence the miracle here is not so much the external fact as the spiritual one, which the former only symbolizes. The author has not expressed himself as to whether the external fact is itself of an inexplicable and miraculous nature; and to him, indeed, the externally miraculous lay only in the unexpectedness and divine appointment of the lance-thrust in the dead body, a thrust which, contrary to intention, revealed to the eyes of the world the symbol of the Spirit that flowed from the death of Jesus. In reality, criticism may with perfect security remain silent as to this spiritually-perceived

¹ Miracle, already Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 36: τῶν ἄλλων νεκρῶν σωμάτων τ. αἷμα πηγνυται κ. ὕδωρ καθαρὸν οὐκ ἀπορρεῖ. Therefore θεοσημία, as in the other signs, παριστάντα τὴν θεότητα. Comp. Friedl. p. 168. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 548. Rendered incapable of putrefaction, Hofm. *Schriftb.* II. p. 490. On the contrary, proof of genuine humanity, Wetst., Olsh., Ammon, and now Bunsen, p. 460 (against Cerinthus); emperor of death, Less, Friedl., Neander, Thol., Krabbe, also Strauss (in the sense of the author), 4th ed. II. p. 551; on the other hand, Hase, p. 261.

² 1 John v. 6; John vii. 38 sq., comp. the marriage at Cana, above, IV. p. 210. Thus Apolin. Hierap. *Fragm. in Chron. Pasch.* Dind. 1, 13: ὁ ἐκχέας ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πάλιν καθάρσια ὕδωρ κ. αἷμα, λόγον κ. πνεῦμα. A testimony from the second century out of the same surroundings as the Gospel; on the other hand, it is remarkable that Origen does not find this symbolism. Recently Weisse (with assumption of a materialistic misunderstanding of the Epistle by the Evangelist), Baur, now also Strauss (*New Life*), Hase on his part (p. 263) with protest against the merely ideal conception. Even Steinm. p. 237: symbolical miraculous sealing of the sacrificial death.

miracle, more correctly as to this ingenious play of fancy; nevertheless, recent writers have, with the aid of anatomists, taken great pains to discover whether what took place was at all conceivable, that is, natural. The answer is to the effect that, in the case of a stab in the region of the heart, blood-matter could flow out only if the wound was made not later than an hour after death; that blood, and not water, would flow out, so long as the pericardium was not pierced in a particular manner, and that, even if the pericardium were pierced in that manner, the blood and water would flow forth mixed, and not separately as the author states.¹ Thus the external fact entirely falls away, being untenable in its most important point. The history of the burial will finally prove that even the lance-thrust, with the consequent flow of blood, has no historical support.

The editor of Matthew has mentioned yet another sign, which depicts the life-giving effects of Jesus's death in a different and more materialistic way than does the Johannine corpse-sign. He adds the resurrection-sign to the temple-sign. After Jesus's death-cry, an earthquake occurred which rent the rocks and opened the graves; and many bodies of holy men fallen asleep, that is, of the Old Testament pious, arose, went into the city, and were seen by many.² This story can by no means be re-

¹ Gruner, *Comm. de morte J. Chr. vera*, p. 47. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 548 sqq. Hase, p. 261. Schleierm. (p. 455) quickly settles the difficulty (mixture, with commencement of the separation of the serum). Langen, p. 357, curtly says (like Krabbe, p. 507) against Baur: immediately after death water collects in the pericardium together with blood, about which Baur, who denies this, could have consulted medical men. Tholuck thinks of a streak of blood in a flow of water; Bunsen, p. 415, of muscle-water. A miracle, Steinm. p. 233. Whilst from ancient times (Langen, p. 356) it has been thought (for easily understood reasons) that the blow was against the right side, it has been necessary recently, in order to come to the pericardium, to establish an especially vigorous blow from right to left.

² Matt. xxvii. 51—53; comp. Ovid, *Metam.* 7, 205 sq.: jubeoque tremiscere montes et mugire solum manesque exire sepulcris. Cicero, *Verr.* 5, 67, see above, p. 171, n. 1. In the Old Test., Is. xxiv. 18; 1 Kings xix. 11, &c. Dead out of the graves, also Diod. 13, 86. Further in Wetst. p. 541. Steinm. p. 225, has a fancy about a symbolical representation of the *μετάθειςς πάντων* to the *βασιλ. ἀσάλευτος* (Heb. xii. 28). Mentioned in Clem. *Rec.* 1, 41: sepulcra patefacta sunt. See next page, n. 2. Yet in *Rec.* 1, 52, no resurrection is assumed.

garded as a fortunate one. It stood in connection with the belief, not that the Messiah must release in a literal sense the pious dead, or must force his way to the nether world to set them free, but that the resurrection of the just was to be effected by his coming into possession of the fulness of Messianic power, which would appear to take place at the moment of his death. It can be left undecided whether the author saw in the occurrence the definitive resurrection of the just or only its prelude.¹ But naturally these occurrences, if they took place at all, would come more correctly and more appropriately after the resurrection of Jesus, which was of so kindred a nature (being also accompanied by an earthquake), and was the tangible commencement of the glorification of Jesus.² It is indeed very surprising that a moment after an earthquake had rent the graves and the dead had risen, the Messiah himself as a dead man was added to the dead in an unrent sepulchre in the rock. And the compromise, introduced by the author himself, by which the dead are represented as appearing in the holy city first after the epoch-making resur-

¹ Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 543, regards the idea of deliverance as an interpolation (based on 1 Peter iii. 19 sq.; comp. also Eph. iv. 9; Irenæus, 1, 27; *Trypho*, 72; *Past. Herm. Sim.* 9, 16). This deliverance from hell first became plastic in the *Ev. Nicod.* (descens. ad infer.). According to c. 1, among the raised (by whom Kuinöl understands the fideles Christi) were the Simeon of Luke's prefatory history and his two sons (who had come to Arimathæa); and at the hour of midnight the light of the resurrection had spread through all hell to Adam, Seth, Abraham, and the other patriarchs, cc. 2 sqq. Also *Anaph. Pil.* 7—9. The Messianic resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 20, &c. *Beresh. Rabb.* 5, 96, f. 93, 4: qui in terra Israel moriuntur, primi reviviscunt in diebus Messie et annos Messie comedent. *Hier. Ketub.* f. 35, 1: jussit R. Jeremia: cum me sepelietis, induite pedibus meis calceos et baculum date in manum meam meque in latius unum reponite, ut cum advenerit Messias, sim expeditus. Schött. pp. 237 sq. Lightfoot, p. 388. Comp. also *Esr.* 7, 28, 12, 33, &c. If it be here objected, what Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 542 sq., mentions, that in both the Jewish and the Christian expectation this resurrection was connected with the advent or the return of the Messiah, not with his death, the answer is, that in our representation also the reference is not to the death, but to the entrance through death into the Messiahship, the second stage in which is the coming again. For this, comp. Luke xix. 12, xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 33; Rom. xiv. 9; Phil. ii. 9. The Fathers represent the raised as going to heaven with Jesus, Meyer, p. 542.

² Hence the Fathers (comp. Ignat. *Magn.* 9) and *Ev. Nicod.* 1 sqq., brought this resurrection (against Matt.) into connection with that of Jesus. Yet even Fritzsche understands *ἐγερσεν αὐτοῦ*, not as the resurrection of Jesus by God, but actively as the resurrection of the dead by Jesus.

rection of Jesus, makes the matter still worse, for in that case the dead rose prematurely, and must have waited patiently for the resurrection of Jesus three days somewhere, probably in their repulsive and now rent sepulchral chambers.¹ Here the apocryphal books have sought help in a double resurrection, one on the day of Jesus' death and another on the day of his glorification.² The novelties and unhistorical details we have been considering reveal the later editor of Matthew, who found already in the book the miraculous signs of the departure of Jesus, and added his fresh sign where he found, not indeed the best place, but the best space.³ This has perplexed the critics; and though these occurrences would look somewhat better if transferred to the day of the resurrection of Jesus, yet, notwithstanding their profound and to Christians edifying meaning, their historical genuineness cannot be seriously defended. When both Jews and Christians are silent, when even the resurrection of Jesus is not believed, when Paul the Apostle, like all the other witnesses of the primitive Church, draws from the resurrection of Jesus only hopeful inferences without a basis of experience as to the resurrection of all other men, could crowds of righteous men with glorified bodies

¹ The situation is equally bad, whether we place the coming out of the graves, with De Wette, after the resurrection of Jesus, or, with Meyer, before, so that they "kept themselves hidden" somewhere ready to go into the holy city after the resurrection. According to the language, both connections are possible. This difficulty has been noticed also by Schleierm. pp. 449 sq., and Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 540. Eichh. *Einkl.* I. p. 447, thought that the author, having regard to 1 Cor. xv., thus strangely kept back these risen dead until the resurrection of Jesus. Also Strauss, *ib.* p. 544.

² *Anaph. Pil.* A. 7: with the crucifixion, the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Moses, Job, seen not only by the Jews, but even by Pilate. Then, *ib.* 9, the resurrection of all the dwellers in Hades on the night of the resurrection. In B. 8, 9, is only the second occurrence.

³ The editor was mentioned above, I. p. 84. Comp. Hilg. *Ev.* p. 109; *Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 71. Scholten, *Aeltestes Ev.*, 1869, p. 239. Kern also, *Urspr. Ev. Matth.* pp. 25, 100, assumed the work of an editor (Greek translator); and Eichh. *Einkl.* I. p. 450, ascribed the alteration to the arranger of the Catholic Matthew. Stroth and L. Bauer thought of interpolation. Fritzsche also was doubtful as to the words *μετὰ τ. ἔγερσ. αὐτοῦ*, and Ewald wanted to read *ἀνθρώπων*. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 541. Hase, pp. 279, 281, who defends the genuineness of the passage, finds the scene indispensable for Matt. xxvii. 54, as does Volkmar, p. 601, on the other side. See below, p. 181, n. 3.

have appeared in the sight of every one in the holy city? There is no need to ask the questions about which Eichhorn was so concerned, what they did there and what became of them afterwards.¹

Such mighty signs of God could not have been without effect upon men. The Gospels have given special prominence to the impression produced upon Gentiles; these stood nearest to the cross, and indeed had already shown themselves to be more susceptible than the Jews. John is silent upon this point, and his silence can be explained; but the earlier Gospels all report the impression produced upon the captain in command, Mark also that produced upon Pilate, and Matthew that upon the Roman soldiers.² The impression produced upon the captain, who according to the vivid description of Mark stood as a witness close to the cross, is referred by Matthew and Luke to the great signs and to the death-cry of Jesus, by Mark simply to the latter. At the same time, in all the reports it is assumed that the death-cry produced the impression of close fellowship between Jesus and God, and of the hearing of the cry by God.³

¹ Meyer (p. 542) thought this incident did not contradict 1 Cor. xv. 20, Col. i. 18; yet *he* (also Olsh., Neander) found in the whole narrative a mythically apocryphal addition. Thus also most modern critics, from Eichhorn, I. pp. 447 sqq., to Schleierm. pp. 449 sq. Rationalism found the graves empty because of the earthquake; again, as results of the earthquake illusions (Hug: dreams) of the Jews (Paulus, Kuinöl). Hase, p. 279, satisfies himself with the "possibility" of cloven graves; Schneckenb. *Urspr.* p. 67, with the possibility of visions by the adherents of Jesus after his resurrection. Objective sights, guaranteeing the living of the dead, are spoken of by Steudel, *Glaubenslehre*, p. 455, then by Krabbe, p. 505, Lange, II. p. 1600, Steinm. p. 226, and even Bleek, II. p. 476. Eichh. *Einkl.* I. pp. 448 sqq.

² The fourth Gospel evidently gives in this connection only essential novelties, not what was old; moreover, the impression produced by Jesus upon the Hellenes and upon Pilate could not be surpassed. The three Gospels: Matt. xxvii. 54, Luke xxiii. 47, Mark xv. 39. The soldiers of Matt. and the alarm are due to the editor, xxviii. 4.

³ Matt. xxvii. 54, as we have it, derives the impression from the earthquake and from what was done (*γινόμενα*). But the language itself, by its clumsiness, betrays the editor, who wrote verses 51—53. The original Gospel would probably have, like Luke (xxiii. 47), only τὰ γινόμε. (Luke, τὸ γινόμε.), according to the preceding context, as in Luke, the death-cry and the veil-sign. But Mark, expounding the γινόμε. of Luke, finds it in the death-cry which he explains. According to Volkmar, p. 600, the prosaic Luke and Matt. have not understood Mark, that is, the heathen faith produced by the cry of the dying Jesus. On the significance of the death-cry in the Gospels, see above, p. 159. Strauss does not admit this, 4th ed. II. p. 544.

Again, the warrior's expression of astonishment varies. According to Luke, he only cries: "Certainly this was a just man!" According to Matthew and Mark: "In truth this was a Son of God!" The exclamation in Luke, which the Acts of Pilate confines to the Jews, will be the most readily accepted; and why should we not believe that such an impression was produced by the Master, when subsequently disciples, both men and women, induced heathen warriors to accept Christianity by the bravery of their confessions and their dying? But one suspicious feature is the connection of the exclamation with an unhistorical sign not even visible from the place of execution, and with an estimate of the death-cry of Jesus that belonged to the Evangelists and not to the Romans; and another is the friendly disposition of the heathens which here again becomes tangible, in spite of the great improbability that a heathen, after the protracted derision to which the cross had been exposed, should have finished with a recognition that could not have been brought about either by the terrible facts that actually occurred or by the death-cry.¹ Pilate's astonishment at the unusually speedy death, which Mark reports, might be more unhesitatingly admitted if it were better attested and were introduced less designedly. But we detect the effort of the narrator to represent Pilate as suspecting a mystery, when we find that Pilate, disposed to be incredulous, fetches the captain from the place of execution to the city, and, upon hearing his indisputable report, makes a present of the corpse of Jesus to Joseph of Arimathæa, as a kind of atonement for the crime.² To say nothing of the objection based

¹ Conversion of warriors, Eus. 6, 5, 41, &c. Not only Bleek and Meyer, but Weiss found the "Son of God" in the mouth of the heathen possible, in a broad heathen sense (Dan. iii. 25). Even Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 544 sq., would allow the phrase, particularly on the ground of the edifying (but, as we saw, unhistorical) closing cry in Luke, if only this exclamation of the captain did not fall under suspicion together with all the rest. Volkmar's exposition, see previous note. He also assumes that this is the third divine utterance in the Gospel. Steinm., p. 238, prefers the exclamation in Matthew, and thinks this penitence and that of the people psychologically inconceivable, except as the fulfilment of the prophecy Zech. xii. 10.

² Mark xv. 43 sqq. The scene reminds us of John xix. 7 sqq.

on the silence of the other sources, it cannot be made to appear probable that Pilate would treat the question so seriously, or that he would withdraw the watch from the place of execution, where the living and dead victims had to be guarded.¹

It must, however, be confessed that the Gospels have given a very temperate description of the impression produced, indeed a description altogether out of proportion to the startling divine signs themselves. The apocryphal writings have here made more striking additions, on the one hand less historical, on the other more proportionate to the mythical miracles. The wonders on the earth, in the sun, moon, and stars which appeared in broad day, men having to burn lights; the processions of the Fathers of Israel, who rose on the day of Jesus' death and wept over the sins of the Jews; those of the other dead who rose on the Sunday—these things are narrated in a grander style, particularly in the later reports of Pilate to the emperor. The triumphant entry of Jesus into the kingdom of the dead is also described in the Gospel of Nicodemus with much pomp.² But the impression produced upon the captain and upon Pilate is also much stronger. The Jews beneath the cross recognize the just man; but the captain, improving upon this, announces the Son of God.³ He communicates this to Pilate and his wife, Pilate fasts the whole day, calls the Jews, reproaches them, asks for an explanation of the darkness in which the stiff-necked insist upon discovering only an ordinary eclipse of the sun.⁴ In close connection with this stand Pilate's reports to the emperor. The briefest of these, preserved in Latin, dated March 28, has, with something like an echo of the Gospels, of John, and of the testimony of Josephus, a tolerably Roman tone and style, and shows how the governor gave up the accused when there was a menace of sedi-

¹ This has been neglected by the critics. Scholten, p. 192, briefly in favour. Surveillance, above, p. 123, n. 1, p. 152.

² The miracles, *Anaph. Pil.* A. B. 7. Descent, c. 4 sqq.

³ *Acta Pil.* E. 11.

⁴ *Acta Pil.* A. B. 11. Comp. above, p. 173, n. 1.

tion, rather out of regard for the emperor than to gratify himself.¹ Earlier and later Greek texts, such as already in the fourth century were in the hands of Eusebius, and even in the second century in the hands of Tertullian and probably also of Justin Martyr, describe in detail all the miracles of Jesus, closing with the greatly magnified miracles of his death.² From these reports of the governor was derived, even in the second century, as is shown by Tertullian, the myth—still accepted by Mosheim, Braun, Lasaulx—of the proposal made by the emperor Tiberius for the apotheosis of Jesus, which fell to the ground simply through the ambitious resistance of the Senate, but in another form bore fruit in the emperor's threats of punishment against the accusers of the Christians.³ A different mode of viewing

¹ *Epistola Pont. Pilati ad Tib. Cæsarem*, Tisch. p. 411. Lightly regarded by Lipsius, p. 17, as a late account. Introduction: De J. Chr., quem tibi plane postremis meis declaraveram, nutu tandem populi acerbum me quasi invito et subtimente supplicium sumptum est. Virum herele ita pium et severum nulla unquam aetas habuit nec habitura est. Sed mirus exstitit ipsius populi conatus omniumque scribarum, principum et seniorum consensus, suis prophetis et more nostro Sibyllis contra momentibus, hunc veritatis legatum crucifigere. Towards the close: nisi ego seditionem pop. prope æstuantis exoriri pertimuissem, fortasse adhuc nobis vir ille viveret, etsi tuæ magis dignitatis fide compulsus quam voluntate mea adductus pro viribus non restiterim. John is suggested by veritatis legatus, Josephus by vident illius discipuli.

² *Ἀναφορά Παλάτου* A. and B., Tisch. pp. 413 sqq. This report is much later than Nicolas (*Études sur l. ev. apocr.* 1866, pp. 355 sqq.) supposes, and Lipsius, p. 16, regards it as a supplement to our Acts of Pilate; on the other hand, Lipsius would refer the *Epist. ad Claudium* (Tisch. *Acta Ap.* pp. 16 sqq., *Ev. Ap.* pp. 392 sqq.), as to its essential parts, to the second century, this epistle being much simpler. Tert. *Ap.* 5 (report of Pilate upon divinitas revelata) agrees with both works; as does also Eus. 2, 2, who finds in Pilate's notification to Tiberius a mention of the resurrection and various miracles, even of the general belief in Jesus's divinity; but Tert. *Ap.* 21 (darkness registered in the archives) knows only the *Anaph.* A. and B. 7. Justin speaks only generally of ἄκρα Παλάτου, *Apol.* I. 35, 38, 48; but it may be that he knew both the *Acta* and the *Anaphora*.

³ Tert. *Ap.* 5: Tiberius, cujus tempore nomen christianum in seculum introivit, annunciatum sibi ex Syria Palestina, quod illic veritatem illius divinitatis revelaverat, detulit ad senatum cum prerogativa suffragii sui. Senatus quia non ipse probaverat, respuit; Cæsar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum. On the authority of Tert., also Eus.-Jerome, *Chron.* ed Schöne, pp. 150 sq., Jerome giving play to his imagination: cum ex consulto patrum Christianos eliminari urbe placuisset, Tib. per edictum accusatoribus Chr. comminatus est mortem. Comp. also *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 430. Clem. *Hom.* 1, 6. Belief in these stories in Mosh. *Diss.* I. p. 380. Braun, *De Tiberii Chr. in Decorum num. referendi consilio comm.* 1834.

the subject might fix upon the fact that, in spite of all the divine miracles, Pilate criminally slew the Son of God. Therefore another writing showed, in the emperor's answer, the imperial displeasure; and the existing "Delivering up of Pilate," a late writing, describes the emperor's severity towards Pilate—whom, in the Acts of Pilate, Magdalena wished to accuse at Rome—and towards Judaism. The latter is extirpated; Pilate, the murderer of the king of the Jews, is beheaded, but on account of his repentance and because he sinned ignorantly is consoled with the hope of the second advent of Christ, in which he can appear as a martyr in company with Procla.¹ Down to the Middle Ages spring up endless fabulous stories in which Pilate meets with less and less favour. Finally, in the "Death of Pilate" he commits suicide with a knife, as the fourth century had already stated on the authority of Greek and Roman writers; and his corpse, thrown first into the Tiber and then into other waters, becomes, through the excesses of the demons, the terror of Rome, of Vienne, and of Lausanne, until it finds its final rest among the Alps, where the demons can lawfully rage, in a spring in the weird, turbid, pine-encircled lake on the top of Mount Frankmund or Pilatus which overlooks Lucerne. As late as the sixteenth, or indeed the eighteenth century, this legend inspired awe, and has now permanently connected itself with the storm-region of that mountain. In the "Revenge of the Saviour," Titus and Vespasian are

Lasaulx, *Untergang des Hellenismus*, 1854. On the other hand, Gieseler, Neander, Baur, and others. The spuriousness can be detected: no ancient author elsewhere knows anything of this, not even Melito (Mosh.), who only generally assumes the friendship of Rome and Christianity, whilst a command or edict of Tiberius would have been in the highest degree welcome. Christians did not yet exist, therefore there were no accusations. Tiberius was a man of enlightenment: *Deorum injurias, Diis curæ*, Tac. *Ann.* 1, 73, comp. Suet. *Tib.* 69. The timid Senate would not have opposed: Tac. *Ann.* 3, 65: *O homines ad servitutem paratos*. As to the alleged right of control over religions, which Tiberius granted to the Senate, and to which Lasaulx specially appeals, comp. *Ann.* 3, 60: *imaginem antiquatis senatui præbebat*, as well as the independent course pursued by the emperor, even in religious matters, 3, 71; 4, 16, &c.

¹ Παράδοσις Παλάτου, and the *Responsum Tiberii*, Tisch. p. 426. Magdalena, *Acta Pil.* B. 11.

represented in horrible stories as marching from Bordeaux in hot anger to annihilate the irretrievably wicked Judaism.¹

But according to the Gospels this very Judaism exhibited some degree of repentance. At least Luke relates that the multitudes that were present became, under the influence of the signs, late but sincere and deeply sorrowing followers of the weeping women of Jerusalem, and returned to the city smiting their breasts after the Oriental fashion.² Upon this is based the assertion of the Acts of Pilate, that the people under the cross acknowledged the just one, and after the resurrection bitterly condemned the unrighteous deed of Annas and Caiaphas. But if the signs have to be given up, these believing and penitent multitudes must also be given up; moreover, there is elsewhere no trace of the latter, either in the Gospels, or in Paul, who looks for the repentance of Israel only in the future. Nor is there any trace of them elsewhere in Luke, who in the Acts of the Apostles expressly places the call to repentance and the fact of the repentance at a later point of time, during the ministry of the Apostles.⁴ At the same time it may be admitted that the ante-dated Golgotha repentance corresponds, not only to the material greatness of the signs and the spiritual greatness of the facts, but also to the sentiment of the Gentile-favouring author, who would offer the hand of reconciliation to the antagonistic Judaism, and wished

¹ The suicide of Pilate (ποικίλαις περιπεσιών συμφοραῖς) under Caligula, Eus. *H. E.* 2, 7; *Chron. l. c.* Later writers say he died thus an exile in Gaul (comp. Oros. 7, 5; Frez. *Chron.* 2, 1, 12). According to *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 459, Malal. p. 256, beheaded under Nero. Comp. Leyrer's article on Pilate in *Herzog. The Mors Pilati*, Tisch. pp. 432 sqq. On the Swiss Pilatus legend, which goes back as far as the eleventh century, and which is not yet quite explained, comp. especially Alois Lütolf, *Sagen, Bräuche und Legenden aus den fünf Orten*, Lucerne, 1865, and briefly Ed. Osenbrüggen, *Kulturhistor. Bilder aus der Schweiz*, 2nd ed., 1867, pp. 74 sqq. *Vindicta Salvatoris*, Tisch. pp. 448 sqq.

² Luke xxiii. 48. Also *Acta Pil.* A. 11.

³ *Acta Pil.* B. 11 (just man). B. 14 (reproaches).

⁴ Rom. ii. 4, xi. 23; 1 Cor. ii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 16; Acts ii. 38, iii. 17 sqq. Also Clem. *Rec.* 1, 41 sq., deny any repentance: cum omnis mundus commotus sit, ipsi etiamnunc ad inquisitionem tantarum rerum nullatenus commoventur.

at one and the same time to give to the solemn predictions of Jesus their fulfilment and to take away their sting.¹ And perhaps it was from a Jewish Christian source he borrowed this detail; if so, the incident was there dictated by an immediately practical desire to give expression, in the repentance of the people upon Golgotha, to the hope of the final entrance of the Jews into the Church and the then possible advent of the Messiah from heaven.²

There still remained a repentance or expiation, the proof of which was more urgently needed than anything else, the expiation of the Apostle who had betrayed his Master to death. Not until after the consummation of the crime, says Tacitus of Nero's murder of his mother, was the greatness of the crime recognized. As to the betrayer, we have two accounts. According to the editor of Matthew, Judas paid for his crime with his life, even before his Master had ceased to breathe.³ When Judas saw that the case was to have a fatal issue, that the morning Sanhedrim had pronounced its "Guilty" and was on the point of delivering the condemned up to Pilate, he hastened with his thirty pieces of silver to the high-priests and elders, exclaiming: "I have sinned, for I have betrayed innocent blood!" He wished to return the unclean money, but it was coldly and contemptuously rejected: "What is that to us? See *thou* to it." Then in anger and disgust he threw the money into the temple, went away, and hanged himself, thus being, as it were, the maker of his own cross. The high-priests were not able to add this price of sin (Deut. xxiii. 18) to the sacred treasure; so they decided to buy with it a potter's field to be used as a burial-place for strangers. This spot bore the name of its origin, "Field of Blood;" and not only the editor of Matthew, but Jerome and the later tradition also, could

¹ Luke xix. 41 sqq., xxiii. 28 sqq.

² Acts iii. 17 sqq. Comp. the remarks upon the repentance of Israel as condition of the return of the Messiah, above, II. pp. 226 sq. According to Clem. *Rec.* 1, 70, only the hostile man (Acts viii. 3) prevented the repentance of Israel.

³ Matt. xxvii. 3—10. First attested by the anonymous author quoted by Eus. 5, 16, and *Ep. Smyrn.* c. 6, comp. Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1861, p. 304. Tac. *Ann.* 14, 10: *perfecto demum scelere magnitudo ejus intellecta est.* Langen, p. 259.

point to its site on the south of Jerusalem and of Mount Sion, by the Pottery Gate of Jeremiah in the valley of Hinnom.¹ In the Acts of the Apostles, however, Peter relates differently the fate of his colleague.² According to this account, Judas did not destroy himself, but still found pleasure in life, and acquired a piece of land with the price of his sin. Yet what *he* did not, was done by divine justice. Only a few weeks at any rate after the death of Jesus, and upon his own newly-acquired property, he fell headlong, burst asunder in the midst, and his blood flowed over his land, which on this account was called the "Field of Blood." Outside of the New Testament, the apocryphal writings are here remarkably temperate; but Papias, the primitive collector of the most ancient traditions, in the fourth book of his "Exposition of the Lord's Sayings," related the end of Judas still differently.³ His whole body was horribly swollen, so that he could not pass where a wagon could easily find a passage; and the narrative, prudently accommodating itself to that in the Acts of the Apostles, added that Judas actually had a fatal encounter with a wagon, which so crushed him that his bowels were forced out.⁴ Not even the betrayer's head, the narrative continued, could pass where there was room for a wagon. His eyelids were so swollen that they shut out every ray of light, and so completely covered his eyes that no surgical instrument could find them. Even

¹ Acts i. 19: 'Αχελδὰμᾶ (C. and Vulg. Haceldama). Jerome, *Onom.* 31: Acheldama (Eus. 'Ακελδὰμᾶ, Aram. chakal dema = ager sang.), ager sanguinis, qui hodieque monstratur in Aelia ad australem plagam (Eus.: ἐν βορείῳ, on the north) montis Sion. Comp. Eus. *Onom.* 216 sq. (ἐν προαστείῳ). Also Jer. xix. 2. Friedl. p. 100. Robinson, II.

² Acts i. 16—20. On the reasons for the silence of the other Gospels, Aberle, p. 33, has a great deal to say, *e.g.* the declaration of Jesus's innocence by Judas was to them of extremely doubtful value.

³ *Cutena in Acta S. Apost.*, ed Cramer, Oxford, 1838, p. 12 (comp. also Münter, *Fragm. Patr.* I. pp. 17 sqq.). Similarly Theoph. on Matt. xxvii. 5, and Schol. Apolin., Neander, p. 521. Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 482, 491. Anger, *Synopsis*, 1st ed. pp. 233 sq. Are all these amplifications to be referred to Papias himself? The numerous variations, and particularly the collision with the wagon introduced by Eumenius under the name of Papias, make this doubtful.

⁴ The addition to Acts i. 18 in Eumenius, Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 490.

those members of his body were described about which it is usual to be silent. Thus the wretched man died upon his own land, after long-continued suffering, accompanied by offensive discharges and worms; but the intolerable stench betrayed to a late posterity the divine judgment upon the ground itself.

How much in this progressively repulsive picture is historical? The different narratives, which some critics have so carefully and so ludicrously harmonized, show that nothing certain was known about the end of Judas, and that plastic shape has simply been given to the assumption that he was punished in the various dreadful modes which the Old Testament gives in the fate of the traitor Ahitophel and of the persecutor Antiochus, or in the predictions of the Psalms.¹ The narrative of the editor

¹ Harmonies, from the ancients down to Fritzsche and Langen (p. 260). Vulg. Matt.: laqueo se suspendit. Acts: suspensus crepuit medius. Separating two acts, Œcum. Act.: οὐκ ἐναπέθανε τῇ ἀγχύρῃ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ βίῳ κατενέχθης πρὸ τοῦ ἀποπνιγῆναι. Later aids rejected by Neander, Bleek, Meyer; see Strauss, *l.c.*, and the commentaries. Worthy of special mention, Lightfoot, p. 384: the devil strangled him in the air and then threw him down. But Aberle, p. 33, and Steinm., p. 100, do not find Matt. and the Acts of the Apostles contradictory; the latter assumes the former, only introduces further details. The acquisition of the field by Judas only a rhetorical figure (Aberle). De Wette, Ewald, Pressensé (as already Paulus) find it probable that Judas took possession of his purchased land, and there, in some way, ended his life. Ewald, again, p. 536, thinks that perhaps the hierarchs consecrated the subsequent burying-place with the body of this Galilean.—The differences that run through the accounts of Matt. and Luke are: (1) According to Matt. hanging, according to Luke an accidental fall; (2) Matt., possession of the money; Luke, purchase of the field; (3) Matt., speedy renunciation of the gold; Luke, longer possession of the property bought with the money; (4) Matt., purchase of the field by the hierarchs; Luke, by Judas; (5) Matt., name of the field derived from the blood-money; Luke, from the death of the criminal.—As Old Testament type, the nearest parallel is the deserter from David, Ahitophel, whose plans David, fleeing before Absalom, asked God on the Mount of Olives to thwart (comp. Matt. xxvi. 24), and who afterwards hanged himself, not exactly out of remorse, but out of vexation and disappointment, 2 Sam. xv. 30 sqq., xvii. 23. In the "Book of the Jubilees," Cain is said to have hanged himself, Ewald, p. 535. Suicide by Jews, 1 Sam. xxxi. 4; Jos. Ant. 12, 4, 11; B. J. 3, 8, 5. In the second century, several relate that the founders of Montanism, Montanus and Maximilla, hanged themselves after Judas's example. See anonymous writer quoted by Eus. 5, 16. Zeller notes that the Gnostic leaders, Simon and Dositheus, met with their end by falls, Theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 11. The parallel of Antiochus is to be found partly in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, partly in the later (Papianist) narrative, see 2 Macc. ix. 5, 7, 9. Even Aceldama in Matt. may be connected with 2 Macc. ix. 4. Certain passages in the Psalms come in here still more influ-

of Matthew—for we have to think only of him—although the most thrilling and to a certain extent the finest because of the suddenness of the vengeance, the self-judgment, and the suicide, is the least supported of all the accounts.¹ For it rests to a great extent upon a very violent and in all respects incorrect application of the prophet Jeremiah, more correctly Zechariah, to the history of Judas.² In particular, the potter's field does not exist at all in Zechariah, but is a mistake in translation.³

entially. From the time of Paul (Rom. xv. 3; Matt. xxvii. 34; comp. Ps. lxi. 9, 21), Psalm lxi. had been applied to Jesus as a Messianic Psalm; now Matt. needed it for the snare (Ps. lxi. 22), Luke avowedly for the desolation of the piece of land bought by Judas (Acts i. 20; Ps. lxi. 25), the Papias myth for the description of the eyes of Judas (Ps. lxi. 23). But Ps. cix. also lay very near at hand, and verse 25 formed with Ps. xxii. 7 a well-known feature of the evangelical tradition (Matt. xxvii. 39). This Psalm cix. has fed all the three sources. In Matt. we are reminded of verse 18, in the Acts it is the author's wish that we should think of vv. 7 sq., and in the Papias myth we are reminded of verse 18. These connections with the Old Testament are assumed especially by Strauss, Zeller, and Renan. But most moderns are more or less influenced by them, and not only Weisse, p. 452, but even Neander, p. 521, do not defend the historical character of our accounts; Bleek, Hase, Meyer (although the latter protests against the above assumptions), and others, seek to save only the most general features.

¹ Luke is preferred by the anonymous writer in Schmidt's *Bibl.* II. ii. pp. 248 sqq. (because he glorifies but little), by Bleek, II. p. 449 (Matt. uses a late oral source); comp. De Wette, Ewald, Pressensé, also Weisse, who, against Matt., mentions Papias (above, p. 188). On the other hand, Schenkel, p. 268 (as well as Aberle, Steinm.), finds the account in the Acts of the Apostles more recent. The narrative in Matt. has already, above, I. p. 82, been ascribed to the editor. Hilg. *Ev.* p. 109; Scholten, p. 238. Thus also Renan, 15th ed. p. 454. The certain sign is the preponderant use made of the Hebrew Old Testament, see briefly Anger, *Ratio*, I. p. 41; next, the great break in the context in Matt. xxvii. 2 and 11, the impossibility of the introduction of the high-priests and elders, xxvii. 3, after verses 1 and 2, the premature mention of the condemnation in verse 3, and finally the total silence of Luke and Mark.

² Matt. xxvii. 9 quotes a prophecy of Jeremiah (spuriousness of the word, Friedl. p. 101); but the writer confuses in his memory (Jerome, Aug.) the potter-passage of Jer. xviii. 2 sqq., with the field-purchase in Jer. xxxii. 9, and in reality makes use of Zech. xi. 12 sq., as before Matt. xxvi. 15. Explanations, from Origen on Matt. V. 117 (suspicio aut errorum esse scripturæ et pro Zach. positum Jeremj. aut esse aliquam secretam Jeremjæ scripturam), down to Hofm., Hengst., see Meyer, p. 522, and now Steinm. pp. 105 sqq.

³ The violence done to the passage does not after all lie so much—and this (especially by Strauss) has been generally emphasized—in making a completely wrong application of the passage, (in Zechariah *God* disdainfully returns the wretched wage of his pastoral office exercised in Ephraim by the prophets, whilst here it is the *betrayed*

On this account, and because of the five-fold contradiction of the Acts of the Apostles, we lose confidence in this picture, though we might retain the act of suicide without these additions. The most probable supposition would be that the "Field of Blood," mentioned, though in very different senses, in both Matthew and the Acts of the Apostles, points to an historical fact.¹ But who knows whether some locality bearing this name was not fictitiously and in different ways referred back to Judas by much later Christians? It probably appears hypercritical in the eyes of many to refuse to believe at least in the suicide or in the sudden God-inflicted punitive death of Judas.² As if belief in what has been demonstrated to be an extravagant myth would not be folly; and as if it was not most natural to find that the horror of the Christians and their genuinely Jewish sentiment of righteousness regarded the malefactor who at once disappeared from Christian circles as a victim of divine anger, though the Christians did not, as Renan suggests, kill him!³ Perhaps our

of the sent of God that does this), for there is a parallel in the facts that (1) the wage is the people's disgraceful wage to God and His prophets, (2) the betrayer as penitent, and to that extent himself in part an organ of the truth, returns the disgraceful wage. The violence lies chiefly in the erroneous translation. There is nothing in the prophet about a potter's field, or even about a potter (comp. Hitzig, *Komm. kl. Proph.* 3rd ed. p. 374), since, instead of el-hajazer (cast it to the potter), the correct reading rather is el-hajozar (into the treasury); and instead of hajakar (the beloved or prized), hajekar (the value); and finally, the conversion of "I took" and "I cast" into "they took" and "they gave it for the field of the potter," is quite arbitrary. The translation should be: "Cast it (the wage) into the treasury, the splendour of the worth at which I am valued by them. Then I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them into God's house, into the treasury." Steinmeyer (p. 107) has the boldness to find the translation of the Gospels correct to the eye of "the Scripture-believing theologian." Krabbe (pp. 456 sq.) had at least asserted that the Gospel narrative was independent of Zechariah.

¹ Comp. Ewald, pp. 535 sq.: the burial-place existed, and the Christians (to which also the Galilean Aram. word points!) called it Hakeldama. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 485, more correctly: the "Field of Blood" existed, and the Christians gave it a reference to Judas.

² Thus, e.g., Hase, p. 232; also Meyer. Even Zeller, *l.c.*, is inclined to find an early death possible. Rightly sceptical, Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 492; *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 348.

³ Renan, 15th ed. p. 454, thinks of a quiet life of Judas on his property; perhaps, however, he was the victim of the vengeance of the Christians.

sense of justice demands this satisfaction, perhaps we ourselves find only suicide to be the correct issue of the frightful antinomy which must have commenced in the soul of the unhappy man as soon as he came to himself. But we should not forget that the cold-blooded determination, the reckless audacity, with which Judas proceeded against his Master, presupposed a callousness which, as the Acts of the Apostles gives it, was certainly not for hours and days and perhaps never subdued.¹

There is now left to our gaze only the cross standing with the corpse, which with terrible realism—if not with the crudeness of the illustrations in Renan's "Life of Jesus"—reveals the bitterness of death and a shameful close, without alleviation and satisfaction, without divine light or darkness.² The gloom and the darkness of this event—in the description of which Lactantius missed and yet did not really need the eloquence of Cicero upon Verres' crucifixion of Gavius—clear away only before the spiritual eye which sees in him the Great One, the Messiah, although he thus died, and also because he thus died.³ In order to perceive the signs of glory, one must look beyond Golgotha to the victory of the Crucified who overcame the grave and human infirmity, and to the rapidly occurring and consecutive discomfitures of those who slew the Messiah on the cross. It is a reasonable ground for surprise that the Gospels—we cannot tell whether from ignorance of or indifference to the details of contemporary history—have read no divine sign in the inglorious deposition of Caiaphas from the high-priesthood, of Pilate from the procuratorship of Judæa, *a year after the death of Jesus* (A.D. 36). But a general perception of this character has not

¹ Origen, *l.c.*, describes the positive and the negative elements in the penitence of Judas. Steinm., p. 104, finds that this penitence lacked a moral motive; its ground was the recognition of the fact that he was selected to fulfil the destiny of the Messiah.

² *Vie de Jesus, edit. illustrée de soixante desseins*, par G. Durand, 1870, pp. 292, 300. Jesus is here robbed of all dignity, and converted into a modern Arab; and in the Golgotha pictures he becomes a mere victim without ideality, in fact of the criminal type.

³ Lact. *Inst.* 4, 18: non enim Gavianam crucem describimus: there suffered one who was innocent, but a mortal, here a God!

escaped them, and they themselves have exhibited, instead of the merely figurative divine signs, the real and actual ones, showing that with the death of Jesus, with the frivolous rejection of the Messiah who was called of God and of men, and whose mission it was to dissipate the dreams of temporal dominion, the history of Judaism started on its downward course.¹ They point to the destruction of Jerusalem, which the prophetic lips of Jesus are said to have designated as his avenger. We—without following Renan in his wanton denial of a clear connection—turn our eyes, not alone to the burning of the temple and to the thousands of crosses with which Titus fringed the walls of Jerusalem, but also to the long, endless, hopeless history of Jewish decadence, to the historical and terrible corruption which, under the co-operation of tyrannical emperors and procurators, of puppet Jewish kings, of spiritually festering masses of the people, and of carnal patriots, from the emperors Tiberius and Caligula to Claudius and Nero, lasted for a whole generation, only to close with the frightful *coup de grâce* given by Titus's destruction of Jerusalem.²

B.—THE DAY OF DEATH.

Having treated of the year of Jesus's birth and the year of the commencement of his ministry, the last question that remains to

¹ On Caiaphas and Pilate, see the sub-division B. To some extent the later Pilate myth is connected with the fact of the speedy removal of Pilate. We might have been reminded also of the speedily following death of the emperor Tiberius (spring, A.D. 37), and the speedily following fall of Antipas in A.D. 39 (see above, I. p. 272), if it were but possible to establish one act of theirs against Jesus. Merely as a curiosity I quote Ad. Schmidt's *Gesch. der Denk- und Glaubensfreiheit im erst. Jahrh.* 1847, p. 185, where it is said to be no wonder that Jesus was executed under Tiberius as a worker of miracles, because at that time all magicians and sorcerers were persecuted.

² Comp., besides the apocalyptical sections of the Gospels, particularly Matt. xxii. 7, Luke xix. 27, 41 sqq., xxiii. 28. Of the Fathers, see Eus. 3, 6. Among moderns, Renan is a remarkable exception in devoting a whole chapter (the 27th) to the "Fate of the enemies of Jesus." But whilst the reader is led by the title to expect here a Christodicy, it pleases the author to show that Caiaphas and Pilate, though soon after deposed, finished their career unchanged and unbroken in spirit, that Annas and

us is to inquire as to the year and the day of his death. Our narrative of the journey to and the catastrophe at Jerusalem has partly evaded this question, though, on the other hand, it has, without adducing proof, made use of certain provisional chronological calculations. These have now to be more precisely established. The demand that the date of the departure of Jesus from earth should be more exactly defined is one which is not generally thought to require either justification or apology. It behoves faith to engrave the day of the Great Sufferer's death and victory upon a faithful memorial; and it behoves history to possess a punctual and distinct acquaintance with this epoch-making event, by a knowledge of its date to throw light upon all its details, and to place upon a firm basis of chronology and fact the subsequent developments of Christianity and of the Apostolic Church. Our calculation of the year in which Jesus commenced his ministry has partly performed this task: Jesus made his first appearance as teacher of the people in A.D. 34, and nothing can be more certain than the brief duration of a ministry which was so speedily molested, troubled, and persecuted by the animosity of the ruling hierarchy. Hence, as some ancient accounts speak of a scarcely more than one year's ministry of Jesus, the death of Jesus can readily be placed at the Easter of A.D. 35. But since it was very early held by others that the ministry of Jesus lasted at least from two to three years, since, moreover, the calculation of the year A.D. 34 as that of Jesus's first appearance as a teacher has not been established beyond a probability strongly attacked by many, it is necessary that at this last station we should take in hand the chronological question with fresh energy, and carefully seek for the historical indications which may furnish or establish the time of Jesus's death. At the same time, those readers who are no lovers of such questions may partly or entirely dispense with these inquiries.¹

Caiaphas even died in the greatest honour, and that the catastrophe of Jerusalem had simply nothing at all to do with the death of Jesus.

¹ In recent works on the history of Jesus, these questions (with the exception of that of the Passover evening) have been very much neglected, less by Paulus (III. pp. 770

1.—*The Day.*

There is no point connected with this question which can be decided with so little trouble as the day of the week on which Jesus died. The language of all the sources is here plain and incontrovertible, and even between the older sources and John there is no contradiction. According to the universal admission of modern critics also—among whom the opinion of Schneckenburger, who fixes upon Wednesday, no longer finds a defender—Jesus died on a Friday.¹ Matthew mentions as the day of death the day of preparation for the Sabbath, that is the Friday; and on the Sabbath, the Saturday, he makes the solicitude of sorrow and love gather around the sepulchre of Jesus.² Still more plainly has Luke dated the burial upon the preparation-day immediately before the beginning of the Sabbath, that is, upon Friday evening before sunset.³ Finally, Mark has made the date more intelligible by translating the unfamiliar term “pre-

sq.) than by Neander and Schleierm., who merely touch upon these things generally; Renan, who without much proof quickly fixes upon his figures, 15th ed. p. 451; and Strauss, 4th ed. I. pp. 479 sqq., *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 333 sqq., who is on every point sceptical. The earlier literature in Thies, *Komm.* I. pp. 363 sqq., and K. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, 1843, p. 334. To Wieseler's detailed investigation of these questions in the work mentioned are now to be added his essay on the New Testament chronology in Herzog's *R. E.* XXI. pp. 543 sqq., his *Beiträge zur richt. Würdigung der Ev., und der Ev. Gesch.*, Gotha, 1869. A. W. Zumpt's *Geburtsjahr Christi* (with brief reference also to what happened subsequently), Leipzig, 1869. Ch. Ed. Caspari, *Chronol. geograph. Einl. in d. L. J.*, Hamb. 1869. Hitzig, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, Leipzig, 1869, pp. 567 sqq. Herm. Sevin, *Zur Chronol. des L. J. nach d. Synopt.*, Heid. 1870. Lipsius, *Pilatus-Akten*, Kiel, 1871, pp. 21 sqq. On the individual question, Langen, *Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, 1864, pp. 57 sqq. Dan. Isenberg, *Der Todestag d. Herrn J. Ch.*, Hann. 1868. Mor. Kirchner, *Die jüd. Passahfeier und Jesu letztes Mahl*, in the *Progr. des Duisb. Gymn.*, Gotha, 1870. I have reviewed the most recent works of Caspari, Wieseler, and Zumpt, in my essay, *Drei christl. Chronologen*, in the *Prot. K.-Z.* 1869, Nos. 49 and 51.

¹ Schneckenb. *Beiträge*, pp. 1 sqq.: chronology of the Passion week, particularly pp. 8 sqq. Comp. Wies. *Syn.* p. 334; *Beitr.* p. 231. Justin, *Ap.* 1, 67, quite correctly and with a complete emancipation from the Jewish mode of reckoning, takes Friday to be the day of Jesus's death.

² Matt. xxvii. 57 sqq., xxviii. 1.

³ Luke xxiii. 54.

paration-day" into "the day before the Sabbath."¹ Exactly similar are the dates in John.²

Again, concerning the Jewish month and day of the month, there prevails at least no great doubt. All the Gospels place the death of Jesus at the commencement of the Jewish Easter festival.³ This began in the middle of the first Jewish month Nisan, which Josephus makes to synchronize with the Macedonian month Xanthicus, or with the Egyptian Pharmuthi, and like these it corresponded mainly to our April with the inclusion of a part of March.⁴ The middle of Nisan and the Easter festival fell at the time of the first full moon after the spring equinox—that is, according to the customary reckoning of the first century, between the 23rd of March and the latter part of April.⁵ This time of spring, with the first quickening of vegetation, is pointed to also by one of the last sayings of Jesus at Jerusalem, in which he introduced the sprouting of the fig-tree as a sign of the approaching harvest of the world.⁶

But now begin our difficulties. One of these lies in the fact that the Jewish days of the month can be transferred to the Julian calendar by a calculation of the moon's phases, only when we know the year and the positions of the moon peculiar to the year. We are, however, first confronted with a difficulty that lies in the contradiction between the earlier sources and John as to the Jewish number of the day of the month, the former calling the day of Jesus's death the 15th of Nisan, the latter the 14th. Small as this difference may appear to be, it

¹ Mark xv. 42.

² John xix. 14, 31.

³ Matt. xxvi. 2, 5, xxvii. 15; John xi. 55 sqq., xii. 1, 12, 20, xiii. 1, xviii. 28, 39, xix. 14, 31, 42.

⁴ Wies. *Syn.* p. 442.

⁵ Wurm's *Astronomical Contributions to the approximate determination of the years of Jesus's birth and death*, in Bengel's *Archiv*, II. pp. 277, 279. Also Ideler, *Hamb. buch*, I. p. 78. Wieseler, p. 442. The latter, moreover, mentions, on the authority of Ideler, I. p. 78, II. p. 199, an Alexandrian account, in which the spring equinox was said to be the 21st of March. Comp. also *Jos. Ant.* 3, 10, 6; *Eus.* 5, 23.

⁶ Matt. xxiv. 32. The indications of date in Matt. xvii. 24, xxiii. 27, point to a somewhat earlier time.

is nevertheless not unimportant; and the gigantic efforts which have been made to establish agreement, or a superiority of one authority over the other, have been prompted as much by the desire to find the day on which the Lord died, as by the hope to justify belief in the Gospels and in the Apostle John or Matthew.

The earlier Gospels—anticipating, one might almost suppose, the rise of a great controversy and of still greater perversions—most distinctly defined the day before Jesus's death as the first day of the feast of *Mazzot*, or of unleavened bread, and also as the day of the slaughter of the Passover lamb.¹ Now it can be most certainly established from the Old Testament that the Passover lamb was eaten on the 14th of Nisan, at evening, and that the *Mazzot* commenced on the same day.² Though the celebration of the feast is often so described as to make it appear that the feast of the lamb, the Passover, took place on the 14th, and the feast of the *Mazzot*, or more exactly the first day of this seven days' feast, was on the 15th, this difference is not only counterbalanced by a number of other passages in which Passover and *Mazzot* are made to synchronize completely, and the 14th appears as both the Passover-day and the first day of *Mazzot*, but it is also explained by the fact that, according to the Jewish mode of making the day begin with the evening, the beginning of the feast of *Mazzot* on the evening of the 14th in truth belonged to the 15th, while the Passover could be placed on the 14th instead of the 15th on account of the preparations required in the slaughter, offering up, and purification on the afternoon of the 14th.³ Yet even this question is a purely secondary one, since it is enough to know that the day before

¹ Matt. xxvi. 17; Luke xxii. 7; Mark xiv. 12. It is true that Movers and others have made even this passage apply to the 13th of Nisan. Bleek, p. 138.

² Exodus xii. 6, 18.

³ Jos. *Ant.* 3, 10, 5: *πέμπτη δὲ καὶ δεκάτῃ διαδέχεται τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἢ τῶν ἄζύμων ἑορτή.* Also Ex. xii. 6, 15 sqq.; Levit. xxiii. 5 sqq.; Num. xxviii. 16 sqq.; Joshua v. 10. Compare particularly Ex. xii. 18; Deut. xvi. 1 sqq.; and the above passages in the Synoptics, where the Passover day is the same as the first of the *Mazzot*. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2: *τῶν ἄζύμων τῆς ἑορτῆς, ἣν Πάσχα καλοῦμεν.* Comp. Wies. *Syn.* p. 357. Langen, p. 81.

the death of Jesus was, according to the Gospels, the day of the Passover lamb, which it is notorious was offered and eaten on the 14th and on no other day (according to Schneckenburger, on the 13th).¹ These our ancient sources, moreover, expressly tell us that Jesus ate the Passover lamb, not on a day chosen arbitrarily or from necessity—which, indeed, law and custom rendered quite impossible—but on the legally appointed evening on which the whole nation did the same. This follows with certainty from Matthew, where we read that the disciples asked Jesus not when but where he desired to eat the lamb, and that Jesus caused inquiries to be made of the man at Jerusalem concerning the chamber, and not concerning the time of the celebration of the Passover meal.² Still more plainly has Mark spoken of the day on which they, the Jews, the nation, celebrated the Passover feast; and Luke of the day on which, according to the law, the lamb *must* be slain, and for which Jesus almost impatiently waited.³ If, therefore, according to these sources, the day before Jesus's death was undoubtedly the 14th of Nisan, the 15th of Nisan and no other day must have been that on which Jesus died. Between ancient and modern expositors, wherever impartiality is exhibited, there prevails upon this point complete unanimity.⁴

In John, on the other hand, the last evening meal of Jesus, which, though the lamb is absent, evidently coincides with the Passover meal of the older sources, and which, like that, is followed by the day of Jesus's death, is at the outset very

¹ Schneck. *l. c.* p. 14. Similarly, Rauch, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832-3, p. 537.

² Matt. xxvi. 17. Neander, p. 524, could assert that in Matt. xxvi. 18 there lay only a somewhat obscure intimation that Jesus wished to observe his peculiar, anticipated Passover meal.

³ Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7, 15. Haneberg, *Relig. Alterth. d. Bibel*, 2nd ed. p. 645, translates verse 7: the lamb *ought* to have been slain.

⁴ In ancient times, see the *Quartodecimani*, *Chron. Pasch.* 1, 14; but also Justin, *Trypho*, 111 (according to correct explanation, Hilg. *Paschastreit*, pp. 205 sqq.). Irenæus, 2, 22, 3, comp. 4, 10, 1. Origen on Matt. IV. 79. Eus. *Cat. Cordor. in Luc.* 22, n. 12 (Langen, p. 93). *Const. Apost.* 5, 15, and the Latin Church throughout, comp. Langen, pp. 141 sqq. Wies. *Beitr.* p. 271.

distinctly placed before the Easter time, therefore before the 14th of Nisan.¹ For however we may manipulate the expression "before Easter," since the lamb was absent, and since late in the evening at the close of the meal the purchase of food for the feast was spoken of, it is quite clear that the meal was not that of the 14th of Nisan, from which the lamb could not be absent, and which could not be followed by the purchase of food far in the night. That it was an event *before* the 14th of Nisan is also clear from the fact that the celebration of the Passover was still in the future, and provisions for the feast had to be procured before the evening of the 14th of Nisan, with which the feast itself began.² On which day before Easter this Johannine meal fell, we do not immediately learn; but we do immediately learn, what is of most importance, that the day of Jesus's death, which followed that on which the meal took place, was the 14th of Nisan, the day of that lamb celebration of the older sources which the later author dated back to the 13th under the indefinite picture of a meal, in order to gain room for the death of Jesus on the 14th.

Conclusive proof can be adduced to show that, according to John, the day of Jesus's death was the 14th of Nisan. According to this Gospel, the Sanhedrists did not enter the palace of Pilate on the day of the trial and execution of Jesus, in order to avoid being rendered ceremonially unclean and thus prevented from

¹ John xiii. 1.

² John xiii. 29. Among the subtleties in the exposition of xiii. 1 belongs this: contrary to the only correct explanation (Lücke, Meyer, Baüml.), which brings $\pi\rho\theta\ \acute{\epsilon}.$ into connection with the principal verb and the transaction that follows and explains it, the determination of time is sometimes combined simply with the participial sentences, therefore with Jesus's sentiments before the feast, which *at the feast itself* were to be clearly manifested (thus still Wies. *Beitr.* pp. 232 sqq.); or, in a still more fanciful manner, $\pi\rho\theta\ \tau.\ \acute{\epsilon}.$ is referred to the evening of the 14th, the Passover evening itself, because the feast did not actually begin until the morning of the 15th (thus still Langen and Baüml.). Comp. only above, p. 197, n. 3. Meyer, and even Krabbe, p. 464, have rejected such aids. Langen (p. 110) finds the purchase late in the night of the 14—15th possible on the ground that, according to *Tract. Pesach.* 4, 5, only the strict Shammai forbade work on that night; but it is only necessary to read the precise instructions (*ib.*) concerning the preparation for the Passover (above, V. pp. 300 sq.), in order to make the inference impossible.

eating the Passover; and, according to the language of both the Old and the New Testaments, the eating of the Passover is nothing else than the eating of the lamb on the 14th of Nisan.¹ Again, the day of the execution is described as the day of the preparation of the Passover; by which it is impossible to understand anything else than the preparation of the Passover lamb, which in fact began at the stated sixth hour, that is, at noon on the 14th.² There are no passages to be brought forward on the other side; for if it be urged that the release of a prisoner "at the Passover," which Pilate offered to the Jews in the early hours of the day, points plainly even in John beyond the morning of the 14th—which, strictly speaking, would not belong to the Passover feast—to the morning of the 15th, the day of Jesus's death according to the older sources, the answer is very simple, namely, that to the Romans and to the Jews, to the ordinary man, if not also to the precise calendar of the learned, the feast had already begun with the dawn of the 14th, nay, before with the flocking of the multitude to Jerusalem.³ Finally, if any doubt remains as to details, it is dispelled by a glance at the

¹ John xviii. 28; comp. therewith the Old Testament passages, Ex. xii. 6 sqq., &c., quoted above, p. 197, n. 3; also 2 Chron. xxx. 18, and Talmud: achal hapesach. Matt. xxvi. 17 sq., 21; Luke xxii. 11, 15 sq.; Mark xiv. 12, 14, 18. On the other hand, many (Wies., Bauml.) make the eating in John refer to the festival sacrifice of the whole week! Comp. also Casp. pp. 173 sqq. Chrysostom began this exposition of xviii. 28 (πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ πᾶσα); his followers, see in Meyer. Neander, p. 523, determinedly rejects this violent interpretation.

² John xix. 14; παρασκευὴ also in Jos. Ant. 16, 6, 2, in the Talmud arubta (Bux. p. 1659), from ereb (evening). The Hebrew mekinah properly corresponds to the Greek word (Movers), from the verb hekin (to arrange) which actually occurs in this sense, comp. Bleek, *Beiträge*, p. 116. The word generally signifies the preparation hours (comp. Jos. l. c.), or the day of preparation for the Sabbath, factually therefore the Friday, although among the ancients this day was never so called. In our passage it is the day of preparation for the first feast day, which was also the Sabbath. Comp. above, V. p. 300. Contrary to the natural sense, Wies. still explains: preparation day or Friday in the Passover, that is, within the seven days' Passover feast (*Beitr.* p. 252),—an explanation long since refuted by Bleek, l. c., and Meyer, and condemned not only by the actual use of the language, but also by the confusion introduced into the chronology by withdrawing the reference to the day that next comes into notice, since there were several preparation days in the Passover time, the first and seventh days being observed as Sabbaths.

³ See only Jos. Ant. 18, 2, 2, and Matt. xxvi. 17.

fundamental and fondly cherished idea which this Gospel advocates with a veritable passion, viz. that Jesus is to be regarded as the Lamb of God, as the genuine Passover lamb, therefore as having died on the day of the lamb, the 14th of Nisan.¹ How significantly has the Baptist already announced this Lamb of God, and in the tenth hour of the day directed his disciples to him! With what mysterious significance do the three Passover feasts of the ministry of Jesus follow one another, the first two in order to point him out, the third in order to describe his death as the Lamb! In the circumstances connected with the first feast, the wine of Cana points to his blood, the destruction of the temple of God to his body, the serpent of Moses to his cross, and the water and Spirit in the conversation with Nicodemus to the spiritual birth in consequence of his death. At the second feast, Jesus, nearer to his close, speaks as plainly as possible of eating his flesh, of drinking his blood, using expressions which recall the genuine supper of the older sources. At the third Passover, he eats no lamb because he is the Lamb; and the Romans may not break his bones when he is dead, because the law forbade that a bone of the Passover lamb should be broken. He died as the Passover lamb, and on that account he died on the 14th, not on the 15th.² As to this 14th of John, there is perfect unanimity among all those, both ancients and moderns, who shrink from doing violence to the language as it stands.³

¹ Since Paul, 1 Cor. v. 7, Justin, *Trypho*, 111, Irenæus, 4, 10, 1, make this comparison without therefore denying that Jesus did not die until the 15th, on the day after the eating of the Passover lamb, it is a mistake for Wieseler (*Beitr.* p. 267) to bring John into the category of these authors. It is simply a question of the difference between the expression of an idea in a general way, and the detailed development of it with zeal and passion, with art and deception and violence. Apollin., Clem. Al., and others, have the Johannine idea together with the Johannine alteration of history.

² Distinctly so Apollinar. Fragm. in *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 14. Clem. Al. *ib.* Tert. *Adv. Jud.* 8 fin. Jul. Afr. in Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* II. p. 183. Hippol. *Chron. P.* p. 12. Hase, p. 215, thought John would have sufficiently answered his purpose with the Passover meal of the Synoptics.

³ Among moderns may be mentioned particularly Lücke, Bleek, Hase, Ideler, Neander, Sieffert, Usteri, Winer, De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, Renan, Pressensé, Bunsen,

Who can count the violent attempts which have been made, from ancient times until now, to remove the visible contradiction of the sources? A detailed account of this unprofitable labour can without envy be left to Gospel exegesis, especially since the best known expositors have indignantly renounced this wonderful scrupulousness as to the letter of Scripture.¹ Critics have had recourse to two ways of ingeniously reconciling the discordant sources; and the ancient Chrysostom suggested both.² Formerly, when the fourth Gospel was believed in, the earlier sources were generally made to yield to the later source. But since the credibility of the earlier sources has been better known, and that of the younger one more and more weakened, numberless critics have hastened to leave the sinking ship, or, finding it necessary to stop the leaks, have resorted to fresh tactics, and have endeavoured to make John agree with the earlier sources.

The Synoptics agree with John—so say some.³ Since the earlier sources have chronologically defined only the day before, and not the day of, Jesus's death, the plan of the campaign was simple enough: it was only necessary to prove that those Gospels by no means required the Jewish Passover for the supper of Jesus, that they did not exclude a day *before* the 14th, and therefore did not deny that Jesus died on the 14th. Accordingly the critics wrested the texts a little, and said that Jesus had in truth held no real Passover meal, but only an ordinary supper, or a quasi-Passover, like and unlike in time and character to the

Caspari, Isenb.; and of course Bretsch., Baur, Strauss, Weisse, Hilg., Schenkel, Weizs., and others. Comp. Meyer on John, p. 518. Wies. *Beitr.* p. 231.

¹ The discrepancy, already by the Quartodecim. of Apollinarius, *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 14. Among moderns, those mentioned above, of whom the former portion have decided for John, the latter for the Synoptics.

² On John xviii. 28. Either John understood the Passover eating to be the eating during the whole Passover time (John = the Synoptics), or Jesus ate before the Jewish Passover (Synoptics = John).

³ Thus already Apollinarius, Clement, Hippolytus, *l.c.* Thus also the late Greeks, Theoph., Euthym., Philop., Niceph. (Langen, p. 147). Among the moderns, particularly Movers, Maier, and others (quite recently, Caspari, Isenberg); comp. below.

Jewish, which was only alluded to, which in fact was threatened with the axe of destruction. Or they spoke of an anticipation of the actual Passover meal, to which Jesus was led to resort by the divergent practice or astronomy of the Galileans, by consideration for his enemies, or by the crowd of lambs in the temple.¹ But unfortunately the law did not allow any day except the 14th to be selected, and, according to the sources in question, Jesus celebrated his Passover meal strictly on the legal day and in the legal manner.²

John agrees with the Synoptics—say others.³ Ebrard grounded this opinion on the fact that there is in John not a word of express contradiction of the chronology of the others.⁴ The least violent mode of reconciliation was therefore to assume that the ancient sources correctly mentioned the 14th, and John correctly mentioned the 15th, as the Passover day, and both correctly mentioned the 15th as the day of Jesus's death. Just as it was previously represented that Jesus anticipated the Pass-

¹ To the wrestings of the text belongs pre-eminently Sepp's assumption (VI. p. 26) that *πρώτη τῶν ἁζέμων* is comparative (like Luke ii. 2 therefore!), in which he is preceded by Theoph., Calmet, Deyling, Usteri. But scarcely better is the explanation of Lamy, Movers, Aberle, that the evening of the 13th of Nisan was already the 14th. Bleek, p. 138. Langen, pp. 82 sqq. The quasi-Passover already in Clem. Fragm. in *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 14, comp. Weitzel, *Passahfeier*, p. 60; the late Greeks, comp. Langen, p. 147. Among moderns, Calmet, Lamy, Deyling (convenient farewell meal); again, in another way (*πάσχα μνημον.* instead of *θύσμων*, after the manner of modern Jews), Grot., Hamm., Cler.; abrogation (as Lord over the law), Mainus, Seb. Schmid, Weitzel, and others. Anticipation of the actual Passover on account of the divergent custom (Hug) or reckoning (Serno) of the Galileans or of the Jews of the Dispersion in general (harmonized by a two-days' celebration), or in consideration of his enemies, whether on account of their plots (Seb. Schmid), or of their factually delayed celebration (Casaub., Scaliger), or at least of their divergent celebration in consequence of the usage of the Karaites and Sadducees (thus Iken, Ernesti, Kuinöl). Finally, an earlier celebration on account of the crowd (Serno, Ebrard, Isenberg). Comp. on the whole subject, Winer, article *Pascha*; Langen, pp. 76 sqq.; also Bleek, Meyer, Wieseler.

² Exegetical maltreatment of the Synoptics, particularly by Movers, see Bleek's *Beitr.* p. 138. Most recently by Caspari, pp. 171 sqq.

³ On this side particularly Bynäus, Lightfoot, Reland, Bengel, Olsh., Thol., Baumg.-Crus., Kern, Hengst., Luther, Wies., Wich., Friedl., Langen, Ebrard (later), Hofmann, Lange, Baumlein, Kirelmer. The last is especially emphatic in asserting that upon such a question there could not exist a difference among the Gospels (p. 171). Also Riggenbach, *Zeugn. f. das Ev. Joh.* 1866, p. 37, inclines towards the Synoptics.

⁴ In Olsh.'s *Komm. über Leidensgesch.* 1862, pp. 23 sqq.

over day, so it could also be said that the Pharisees or the Jews in general postponed the Passover day, and kept it on the 15th, the day of Jesus's death, instead of the 14th. While Jesus and his disciples celebrated the correct day, the 14th, the Pharisees, the Sanhedrists—on account of the divergent theory of the Rabbanites, or on account of the coincidence of two Sabbaths, or on account of the attack upon Jesus, whom they wished to put to death before the feast—delayed their celebration until the 15th.¹ This assumption, however, ascribed to the Pharisees a lawlessness similar to that which the previous assumption ascribed to Jesus, and one still more difficult to justify. Therefore the critics were driven to other means and ways, to violent interpretations of all kinds, for the purpose of converting John's clearly stated 14th into a 15th. This rough treatment has been already referred to—in a foot-note at least—in our examination of the trial as given by John. In one place John is made to be silent, and—particularly in the supper which he describes or seems to describe on the last evening of Jesus—to avoid as skilfully as possible the Passover meal of the other sources, which really fell upon the last evening.² In another he must make himself heard: but has he not spoken most plainly of the dread of the Sanhedrists lest they should by ceremonial defilement forfeit the right to eat the Passover which was not yet, but was about to be, celebrated? "No," is the

¹ See the hypotheses in the Latin Church, Langen, pp. 93 sq. Compare the theories mentioned on the previous page, notably that Serno (*Tag des letzten Passahmahls*, 1859) attempted to ground thereon the correctness of *both accounts*. Similar also Philippi, *Glaubensl.* I. p. 203, in Meyer, p. 518.

² In order to support this view, it was necessary to find in the Johannine farewell addresses a point where a break could be made, so that the latter part might lead immediately to Gethsemane, to the end. This point was conveniently found in John xiv. 31, "Arise, let us go hence." Lightfoot on John, p. 662, says that Jesus then went to Jerusalem. The addresses to chap. xiv. inclusive belong to the 12th of Nisan and the evening at Bethany (Matt. xxvi. 6), chapters xv.—xvii. belong to the 14th, after the institution of the Lord's Supper. Ant. Bynäus, *De Morte Chr.* I. p. 390, throws back the supper to the 13th, otherwise agrees with Lightfoot. Similarly Bengel, Hess, Venturini, Wichelhaus, Röpe, Döllinger, comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 388. Wich. p. 154; Langen, p. 100; Meyer, *Joh.* p. 454.

loud reply, "quite the contrary! Ceremonial defilement on the morning of the 14th would not have prevented them from being clean again in the evening, and from eating the evening Passover lamb. On the other hand, such a defilement on the morning of the 15th would seriously endanger their right to attend the day's festival sacrifice on the 15th."¹ This superficial vindication is at once met by the fact that the eating of the Passover can be referred only to the lamb and not to later festival sacrifices, and that the eating of the lamb was also conditioned by ceremonial purity on the day of the preparation of the lamb, during the day-time of the 14th.²

After we have renounced the reconciliation of the evangelical contradictions as impossible, it still remains possible to discover whether the correct statement, the correct date of the death of Jesus, be given by John or by the earlier sources. Many modern expositors, who have vigorously opposed any ingenious reconciliation, have as vigorously sided with John against the earlier sources in fixing the death on the 14th instead of the 15th.³ Even Baur, who resolutely defended the earlier sources, confessed that the Johannine assumption was seductive, and that the other statement was beset with difficulties.⁴ Many of the arguments for John upon which much stress was formerly laid have, however, fallen away in the course of time, *e.g.* the supposition that the 15th had never been a Friday among the Jews, or that Jesus, if he had really celebrated a

¹ John xviii. 28. Thus, according to Bynäus and Lightfoot, Hengst., Wies., Wichel.; comp. Langen, p. 116. Wies. *Beitr.* pp. 248 sq. Meyer, p. 520. Differently, Movers and Bleek, p. 114.

² See above, p. 200, n. 1. Comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 17 sq. On the other hand, Wies. *Beitr.* p. 251, referring to *Tr. Pesach.* 8, 8, thinks that one who was unclean until the evening needed only to bathe in order to be in a condition to eat the lamb. But Neander, p. 523, rejects this recourse to the *thibbul jom* (lotio diurna), because the Passover meal required preparation.

³ See above, p. 201, n. 3. Noack, IV. p. 23, informs us that the meal on the evening of the 13th was by no means a Passover.

⁴ *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, p. 434. Comp. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 139.

Passover meal on the evening of the 14th, would not have been allowed by the Law to leave the city in the night.¹ But John appears to retain the advantage that Jesus's arrest, trial, execution and burial are more conformable to Jewish legalism on the 14th, on the day before the feast, than on the 15th, the death-day of the earlier sources, which was a Sabbath-like feast-day. The proximity of the feast-day best explains the haste of the trial, which the Sanhedrists wished to get finished before the feast. By the execution of Jesus on the 14th of Nisan, in accordance with the watchword attested even by the older sources, "Not at the feast!" the profanation of the feast would be avoided, as also the largest number of the dreaded multitudes.² And as in this watchword the older Gospels seem involuntarily to point to the more correct date, there have been found even in them occasional remains of the buried Johannine truth. They speak of Simon of Cyrene, who was coming from the field, perhaps from his work in the field, and they speak of persons passing along the road near the cross, whilst at the feast all business was suspended. They do not say a word about the day of Jesus's death being a feast-day, and this is the more remarkable because they lay very great stress upon the sanctity of the following day, the Sabbath. Hence the day that was not a feast-day, the work-day, therefore the 14th instead of the 15th, seems to be specially commended to us as the day of Jesus's death. The earlier sources "obscured" the facts; they fell into a chronological error because they regarded the supper of Jesus, the quasi-Passover, as a real Passover, as the Passover of the 14th,

¹ Never Friday, Ideler, *Handb. der Chron.* I. p. 519 (thus Aberle, *Quartalschr.* 1865, p. 96, and, with new evidence, Casp. pp. 167, 173); but see also Wies. *Syn.* pp. 354 sq., 366; *Beitr.* p. 233. Baüml. p. 169. Hitzig held the extreme view that the 14th was always Saturday, Wies. pp. 347, 356. Noack, IV. p. 28, does not find Friday in the original Gospel. Going out of the city, above, p. 2.

² Not at the feast, Matt. xxv. 5. Emphasized by Movers, in essay on the last Passover and the day of the Lord's death, *Zeitschr. f. Phil. u. Kath. Theol.* 1833. Herzog, VIII. p. 68.

and were thus compelled to postpone the death of Jesus to the 15th.¹ Perhaps, however, it was less an error of these authors, or of the Jewish-Christian tradition, which connected the celebration of the death of Jesus with the Passover meal, than an intentional ambiguity designed to veil Jesus's divergence from Jewish custom, and to break the point of the accusation of abominable practices made by the Jews against the Christian gatherings.²

Though this argumentation has a plausible appearance, it is nevertheless untenable. Yet the questions which have been raised demand consideration so much the more because they are of high importance not merely for the chronology, but also for the history of Jesus generally, for the actual facts of this work-day or festival judicial dealing with Jesus, the stormy and zealous character of which would at any rate necessarily grow with the feast.

According to the Law, the 15th of Nisan, like many other feast-days, had in itself a Sabbatic rank; servile work was forbidden upon it, and it was even distinguished by the name Sabbath.³ Still there appears to have been a difference. It was forbidden on pain of death even to prepare food on the Sabbath; while this was expressly permitted on the 15th of Nisan, indeed the journey home from Jerusalem was allowed on this day.⁴ But even the Sabbath was not so strictly kept as the letter of the Law would lead us to infer. The prophets incessantly lament over the violation of the Sabbath rest commanded and observed by the patriarchs; and after the exile, Nehemiah introduced a

¹ Comp. Neander, p. 524. Bleek, *Beitr.* 137. Meyer, *Joh.* p. 521. It is admitted by Neander that Jesus alluded to the Passover usages, or indeed kept the Passover on the 13th. Also Krabbe, pp. 465 sq.

² The former, *e. g.* Hase, pp. 215 sq., a view the consequence of which is in reality the unhistorical character of our accounts of the supper. The latter, Aberle, *Kath. Quartalschr.* 1865, pp. 94 sqq., according to which John was the first to speak out plainly, whilst the Synoptics were induced by circumstances to weigh their words very carefully!

³ Ex. xii. 16; Levit. xxiii. 7; Num. xxviii. 18. Sabbath, Levit. xxiii. 11, 15.

⁴ Ex. xii. 16 (comp. xvi. 23, xxxv. 3). The journey, Deut. xvi. 7.

stricter prohibition of buying and selling in Jerusalem only by compulsion. To the Law itself the arrest, trial and execution of a Sabbath-breaker on the Sabbath appears to have been unobjectionable; and in the Books of Kings a high-priest leads an armed and sanguinary Sabbath-insurrection against Ahab's daughter Athaliah.¹ For the explanation of these facts it is necessary to regard the apparently flagrant desecration of the Sabbath from a new point of view. The Old Testament offers this: these things were done in honour of the Lord, they were services rendered to God; even the criminal trial, with its most sanguinary proceedings, partook of the character of a festival and Sabbatic celebration, for the criminal was "hanged before the Lord against the sun."² Much in the New Testament now explains itself. These Evangelists, this Matthew, this Mark, possessing the most exact acquaintance with Jewish customs, do not see any occasion to give an explanation as to how far the Jews could venture to arrange for an execution on the 15th, the well-known feast-day, ignorance of which only stupidity could ascribe to the Evangelists. They certainly betray a much greater respect for the Sabbath than they do for the feast-day.³ Moreover, all the Evangelists, and John with especial copiousness, elsewhere show that official and non-official murderous attempts were made against Jesus, the offender against religion, on the feast-day and even on the Sabbath. On the 9th of Nisan the hierarchs were restrained from violence, not by the Sabbath but only by the people.⁴ The Acts of the Apostles shows that during the Easter festival, by command of the pharisaically strict king

¹ Complaints, Is. lvi. 2, lviii. 13; Jer. xvii. 21; Lam. ii. 6; Ez. xx. 16, xxii. 8; Neh. x. 31, xiii. 15 sqq. The desecrator of the Sabbath, Num. xv. 32 sqq. Athaliah, 2 Kings xi. 4 sqq.; 2 Chron. xxiii. 1 sqq.

² Num. xxv. 4; Deut. xxi. 22 sq.; 2 Sam. xxi. 9. Comp. John xvi. 2.

³ Matt. xxviii. 1, comp. xxiv. 20; Luke xxiii. 54, 56, xxiv. 1; Mark xv. 42, xvi. 1 sq.

⁴ Matt. xii. 14; Luke iv. 29, vi. 7—11, comp. xiii. 10 sqq.; Mark iii. 6; John v. 16, 18, ix. 14 sqq. At the feast, John vii. 30, 37, 44 sq., viii. 20, 59, x. 22, 31, 39. The 9th of Nisan, Matt. xxi. 23 sqq.

Agrippa I., the Apostle James was executed, and Peter was arrested; and the postponement of the execution of Peter to the day after the Passover festival does not seem to have been dictated by religious scruples.¹ We need not go beyond the Gospels to find that it was customary to execute or pardon criminals on the days of the Easter festival, and this would involve a negotiation between the procurator and the people, in spite of the feast-days. And when we discover that during the reign of king David, in the very time of Easter, at the beginning of the harvest, two sons and five grandsons of king Saul were, at the demand of the town of Gibeon and on account of Saul's blood-guiltiness, hanged "before the Lord" to appease the divine anger, and that on repeated occasions in the Old Testament the wheat harvest is brought into connection with divine judgments in lightning and thunder, punishment and atonement, it may be concluded that executions in God's honour stood associated with the Passover, as the feast of spring, harvest, and atonement, from an early antiquity. Three examples of this are afforded by Christianity in the executions of Jesus, of James the Apostle, and of James the brother of Jesus, the last of whom was, according to the testimony of Hegesippus, also put to death on the day of the Passover.²

It is true that these points of view intersect each other both in the times of Jesus and afterwards. In contradistinction to the execution in God's honour, the claims of the most absolute Sabbath rest and Sabbath quiet become more and more strongly pronounced. Josephus, Tacitus, and indeed the heathen literature generally, describe the Sabbath strictness of the Jews. Josephus says that it is contrary to Jewish custom to take journeys, to transact business, to bear weapons, on Sabbaths

¹ Acts xii. 1 sqq.

² 2 Sam. xxi. 9 (above, II. p. 399, n. 2); also 1 Sam. vi. 13, 19, xii. 17 sq.; Acts xii. 1 sqq. Heges. in Eus. 2, 23. Comp. also Baur on the original significance of the Passover festival, *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1832, pp. 90 sqq. A thoroughly correct divination, against which Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 398) is simply sceptical. Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 570; *Alterth.* p. 466, note. See also above, p. 94.

and feast-days.¹ The Romans allowed the Jews to absent themselves from courts of justice on the Sabbath and on the preparation for the Sabbath, and to receive the gifts of bread and money distributed in the capital upon week-days instead of Sabbaths.² Numerous examples show that the Jews would risk defeat, would expose the holy city and the lives of many to danger, rather than meet force with force on the Sabbath.³ Philo held the most just shedding of blood to be a desecration of the Sabbath; and he explained the temporary toleration of Sabbath-breakers in the Old Testament in a markedly different way from the Old Testament itself, giving among other reasons for it, that of regard for the Sabbath.⁴ But these strict principles were never strictly carried out. First the practice became more and more lax, as is shown by the praise given to the exemplary Sabbath strictness of the small party of the Essenes. Then from the time of the Maccabean revival there prevailed in various forms the modified principle that it was allowable, indeed lawful, in case of necessity, of urgent distress, of danger to life, to work, to navigate, to fight, to slay on the Sabbath, in order to serve the Fatherland, to check the triumph of the foe.⁵ Though not much is said of executions, though the principle of acting for God's honour is not made prominent, it is nevertheless at once evident that the principle of self-defence, of the protection of country and religion, factually permitted executions as well as

¹ Jos. *Ant.* 13, 8, 4; *B. J.* 4, 2, 3, comp. 2, 8, 9; ἀργὴ ἡμέρα, *B. J.* 4, 2, 3. Tac. *Hist.* 5, 4: blandiente inertia. Ovid, *Ar. Am.* 1, 75. Hor. *Sat.* 1, 9, 70 sq.; 2, 3, 288. Suet. *Oct.* 76. Dio C. 37, 16 sq.; 49, 22. Comp. above, I. p. 303, III. p. 363.

² Jos. *Ant.* 16, 6, 2. Philo, *Leg.* pp. 1014 sq. Above, I. pp. 263 sq.

³ Dio C. *l. c.* Above, I. p. 303. Reluctantly adopted and strictly limited self-dispensation, εἴ ποτε δέῃσαι, from the time of the Asmonæans, Jos. *Ant.* 12, 6, 2; περὶ ψυχῶν κίνδυνος, *ib.* 13, 1, 3; ὑπὲρ τ. ἀνάγκης, *ib.* 18, 9, 2, comp. 14, 4, 2; *B. J.* 2, 19, 2.

⁴ Philo, *Vit. Mos.* III. § 27 sq., in Wies. *Beitr.* p. 278.

⁵ Essenes, Jos. *B. J.* 2, 8, 9. Above, I. p. 371. Asmonæans, see above, n. 3. Comp. the Rabbinic principle: conservatio vitæ pellit sabb. Above, III. p. 363, n. 2.

the slaughter of the enemy in battle, and went as far towards justifying them as did formerly the stronger principle of the honour of God.

Even the Talmud—to which appeal has so often been made against the earlier Gospels, and from which the 14th of Nisan as the day of Jesus's death could be directly proved—in reality refuses to give a testimony against those Gospels; though its strictest passages are deprived of much of their force by the fact that the time of Jesus and the much later time of the Talmudic legislation cannot be confounded.¹ It is true that in the Talmud the Sabbath prohibitions are strict, and that what is forbidden on the Sabbath is forbidden also on the feast-day.² But it is at once evident that we have here to do with the artificial increase of the severity of observance of the feast-days, which were laxly kept by the people, and—according to the admission of the Jewish commentators Maimonides and Bartenora—the vigorous enforcement of the strict principles of Rabbi Shammai, in opposition to the milder ones of Hillel, the Rabbi who was highly esteemed in the days of Jesus.³ A distinction was nevertheless made between Sabbath and feast-day, the former being declared more important than the latter, and, *e.g.*, the slaying of the Passover lamb being permitted on that day with extreme unwillingness.⁴ To those who inquire for further

¹ Hengst., Thol., Langen, Wieseler, Baumlein, have very strongly objected to the stress laid upon the prohibitions of the Talmud by Movers, *l. c.*, and Bleek, pp. 139 sqq. Comp. particularly Langen, pp. 129 sqq.; Wies. *Beitr.* pp. 272 sqq.; Wichelh. pp. 211; Kirchner, pp. 56 sqq. The testimony of the Talmud to the ereb hapesach as the day of Jesus's death, above, I. p. 23, n. 1 (Lightfoot, p. 323; Bleek, p. 148), is not highly estimated even by Lücke, whilst Bleek, Hase, Krabbe, are inclined to emphasize it. Baumlein rightly says it would be singular if the testimony of Jews were to be accepted against the Synoptics. Aberle, p. 101, offers us what is most striking when he says that the Jewish *vespera sabbati* was the answer to the concealments of the Synoptics; but that John, having at last confessed, broke the point of the Jewish attack.

² *Mishn. tr. Bezah.* c. 5, 2; *tr. Megilla*, c. 1, 5; Bleek, pp. 121, 142; Langen, p. 135.

³ Langen, *l. c.*, comp. Wies. p. 281.

⁴ *M. Pesach.* c. 6, 1. Gravius, levius, Schöttgen, p. 186. Caspari, p. 173, draws from the fact that the Passover was allowed to break the Sabbath, the absolutely in-

details as to the lawfulness of judicial transactions and executions on the Sabbath or the feast-day, it is easy to offer a number of passages in which both appear to be forbidden on the day before either Sabbath or feast-day; but a closer examination shows that only executions, and not judicial sittings, were forbidden in all cases on the Sabbath and the feast-day.¹ It is expressly stated that the Sanhedrim usually met in the stone hall, but on Sabbaths and feast-days in the rampart as late as the evening sacrifice and later, not merely for teaching but for judging. A distinction is expressly made between civil and criminal causes; judging is expressly permitted under certain conditions; it is expressly forbidden only that a condemnation should be brought to an issue on the Sabbath; and the general monition against the hearing of criminal cases on Sabbaths and feast-days is based mainly upon the unseemliness of executions on those days, and upon a regard for the criminal's long and painful anticipation of death.² Whilst it follows from the above that these legislators at any rate disapproved of such a conclusive trial on the feast-day as that which, according to the earlier sources, was held in the case of Jesus, and that they absolutely rejected the execution on the feast-day, it is nevertheless abundantly evident that in doing this they met with contradiction. But this contradiction becomes most palpable when, according to the self-same Talmud, the renowned Rabbi

correct conclusion that the Passover, more sacred than the Sabbath, could never have been the mere preparation-day of the Sabbath.

¹ The prohibition, *Bab. Sanh.* f. 35, 1: ne judicent vesp̄is sabbati nec vesp̄er̄iis diei festi. *Moed katon*, c. 5, 2: non judicant die festo. *Comp. Hier. Chetub.* f. 24, 4. *Moed katon*, f. 63, 1. Lightfoot, pp. 383 sq. Wies. p. 281.

² The rampart (Chel), *Gem. Sanh.* f. 88, 1; *comp. M. Shabb.* c. 1, 2, in Bleek, p. 141. Wies. pp. 279, 281. Civil causes, *Gem. Bab. Sanh.* f. 35, 1, where on the above principle, ne judicent vesp̄. sabb. nec vesp̄. diei festi, the gloss adds: quod quidem obtinet in judiciis pecuniariis caveturque, ne sit scriptio: ut vero in judic. capitalibus non obtinet ea ratio; nam scripta erant suffragia absolventium aut damnantium die præcedente. Lightfoot, p. 384. Langen, pp. 132 sq. Trials allowed conditionally, *tr. Bezah.* c. 5, 2, with the comments of Bartenora and Maimonides, see Wies. p. 280, against Bleek, p. 142. Non-conclusion of a judicial sentence, *Gem. Sanh.* f. 35, 1. Bleek, p. 147. Langen, pp. 132 sq.

Akiba, the spiritual head of the second Jewish revolution under the emperor Adrian, gave expression to the principle that certain criminals were to be taken to Jerusalem at one of the three great feasts, in order to be put to death before the eyes of the assembled nation *at the feast*, in accordance with Deut. xvii. 12 sq.¹ If one of the most prominent of the Scribes insisted upon execution at the time of the feasts, therefore at Pentecost, therefore on the one Sabbath Pentecost festival-day, if he, with an evident appeal to Moses, regarded the sanguinary act of punishment at the feast partly as a means of striking awe into the minds of the people, but partly also, in the spirit of the ancient view, as a satisfaction to the offended and insulted God, then it is clear that the later theories of the Sabbath never completely displaced the ancient view that an execution on the Sabbath or the feast-day was a service rendered to God, and that the condemnation and execution of Jesus, of the alleged blasphemer of God and—what is almost more—blasphemer of the Scribes, occurred under the continued application of these principles on the day of the divine feast, and was thus in harmony with a legitimate and powerful tendency of the Jewish religious spirit.² And the Roman interest was in the closest manner bound up with the Jewish; the persecutions of the Christians of Smyrna and Lyons show that the Romans were fond of

¹ *M. Sanh.* 10, 4: non occiditur neque a iudicibus civitatis suæ neque a synedrio, quod est Jafne; sed ad summum syn., quod Hierosolymis est, deducitur atque istic in custodia asservatur usque ad festum (ad haregel) et in festo interficitur. Wetst. p. 514. Bleek, pp. 145 sq. Wies. p. 280. This view harmonizes essentially with Philo, who recognizes in Num. xv. 13 sqq., a divine judgment. Wies. pp. 277 sq.

² If it be said here that at least the executions did not take place on the especially holy day of the feast (Fritzsche on Matt. pp. 763 sqq.; Krabbe, p. 465), evidence to the contrary is found particularly with respect to Pentecost. The ancient Pentecost, Levit. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26; Acts ii. 1; Jos. *Ant.* 3, 10, 6; 13, 8, 4 (one day). In the already mentioned passage from the Talmud, it is said to be a greater offence to speak against the Scribes than to speak against the Scriptures themselves; Bleek, p. 145. In *Shabb.* f. 119, 2, Rabbi Judas gives expression to the great principle: non alia de causa devastata est Hierosolyma, quam quod spreverunt viros eruditos, Schöttgen, p. 207. Hengst., Thol., Wies., Langen, also think of an execution that is a service rendered to God.

furnishing the festival gatherings of the provinces with the impressions and terrors of executions.¹

Thus the probabilities for the 14th or the 15th of Nisan stand pretty evenly balanced. Trial and execution on the 14th is, in a certain sense, the easier, less troublesome reading, since the day before the feast appears more suitable for such purposes than the feast-day; although the severe critics of the earlier Gospels, who so quickly settle the question by accumulated passages from the Talmud, cannot fail to observe that, if the Talmud is to decide, even John's day before the feast could not be used for such proceedings. But the 15th, though the more difficult reading, is also the stronger, and the more suggestive of the storm of maddened passion against Jesus. It is on the whole tenable, whether we fix our attention rather on the distinction between feast-day and Sabbath, or on the double applicability of both feast-day and Sabbath. In fact, John seems to allude incidentally to this double right, when he in one place makes Jesus speak of the erroneous conceit of doing God service by committing murder, and in another place makes Caiaphas the high-priest speak of an indispensable "defence" against the ruin of the nation.² It is, moreover, tenable in detail against the attacks which have been very copiously made upon the different "illegal" transactions on the feast-day. The Law presented the less obstruction to the arrest and trial of Jesus in the festival night, because the Passover solemnity was over and the night was notoriously less sacred.³ The festival morning was also spared in so far as the sentence was pronounced early, and the execution was in the hands of the Romans rather than of the Jews. The feast-day, or indeed the Sabbath, permitted the coming from the field and the

¹ Eus. 4, 15; 5, 1: πανήγυρις πολυάνθρωπος ἐκ πάντων τ. ἐθνῶν συνερχομένων εἰς αὐτήν.

² John xvi. 2, xi. 47 sqq.

³ Comp. Ex. xii. 10. Also Bleek, p. 128. But we cannot appeal (Wies. *Beitr.* p. 274) to the Jewish pilot (*Synes. Ep.* 4, p. 163, ed. Petav.; also in Winer, article *Sabbat*), because it was not the *night* that ultimately allowed him to use the helm on the Sabbath, but present and extreme *danger to life*.

passing to and fro by the cross.¹ Finally, the "work" of sepulture could, as a work of necessity, be as well performed on the feast-day as the preparation of food; and even if this had not been so, yet, since humanity and ceremonial purity demanded the taking of the dead from the cross and their burial, it was, according to Moses and the Talmud, more allowable to do this on the evening of the feast-day than at the commencement of or during the Sabbath.

After all, the advantage lies incontestably with the earlier Gospels. It is one of the most certain things in the world that Jesus before his death kept the Passover, that he celebrated it with the people on the legal day; and on that account simply, and not for the sake of an ordinary meal, did he venture once more upon the dangerous journey to Jerusalem. It is equally certain that he could observe it only on that day, and therefore that he could have died only on the day after, that is on the 15th, and not on the 14th.² If the Gospels are not credited, Paul must be the ancient witness, who, though he does not mention the Passover meal—a fact that Bleek finds to be important—yet describes a last meal of Jesus which essentially agrees with the Passover meal of the Gospels, indeed alludes in sufficiently definite and peculiar expressions to the usages, to the very designation of the cups, of the true and genuine Passover meal.³ When

¹ Luke xxiii. 26; Mark xv. 21; Matt. xxvii. 39. Bleek (why, therefore, not also Aberle, Caspari and Isenb.?) very vividly emphasized the field, which would indicate a work-day; on the other hand, Langen thought the man was simply going to inspect his land, and not to work upon it. Comp. also Baümlein, p. 168. But it is no "field;" see above, p. 129, n. 2. In Matthew the expression is not found at all. The "Sabbath-day's journey" was permitted; how much more a journey on the feast-day!

² The special character of this last journey is pointed out particularly by Wies. p. 560, although only the Synoptics disclose this situation, whilst John is here so reticent, that he does not once say that the meal was eaten at Jerusalem; John xii, 36, xiii. 1. See, however, xviii. 1.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 23 sqq., comp. v. 7, passages from which it may be inferred that Paul and his Gentile-Christian congregations observed this Easter of Jesus's death in connection with the Jewish festival time. But we cannot appeal (Wies. *Beitr.* p. 269)

Lücke takes the trouble to assert that Paul placed the death of Jesus on the same day as John because he calls Jesus the Passover lamb slain for us, it is overlooked that one put to death on the 15th could very well be spoken of as a Passover lamb, since nothing was nearer at hand than this comparison, and the Passover lamb really belonged to both the 14th and the 15th. Lücke has also most carelessly shut his eyes to the decisive fact of the Passover meal of Jesus so clearly described by Paul.¹ Even the ecclesiastical tradition of the second century favours the day of Jesus's death given by the earlier sources. The church of Asia Minor, and the churches of Syria, Cilicia and Mesopotamia, which afterwards gathered round it, have, since the second half of that century, repeatedly and with uncommon energy defended the celebration of the 14th as the Passover-day, the 15th as the day of Jesus's death, not merely as the genuine account of Matthew, but as the genuine bequest of the oldest, of the apostolic, period, even of John the disciple of Jesus, against the divergent anti-Jewish custom of Rome and against the account of the fourth Gospel.²

This strong objection to the testimony of the fourth Gospel is not removed by the fact that Rome and her allies, and Palestine in particular, appeal to the most ancient usage, nay to the apostles; for no one, certainly not the new Gentile-Christian church of Palestine without a past, could, with such a holy

to Acts xx. 6. Against Bleek, Lücke, Krabbe, already Neander, p. 524. Baüml. p. 169.

¹ Lücke, pp. 257 sqq. Against Lücke (and thus also Isenb. p. 17), Neander and Baüml. *l. c.*

² See, briefly, Eus. 5, 23—25, *Vita Const.* 3, 5, 18; Athan. *De Syn.* 5; particularly Polycarp, Polycrates, and Irenæus, Eus. 5, 24; the extracts from Apollinarius, Clement, and Hippolytus, in *Chron. Pasch.* 1, 12 sqq. Also the researches of Baur *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844—1857) and Hilgenfeld (*Passahfeier*, 1860) on the Passover question, especially with reference to the subtleties of Weitzel and Steitz, which are rejected also by Bleek. Wieseler has also expressed himself in a similar way, *Beitr.* pp. 268 sqq. Schenkel, pp. 357 sqq. Noack, IV. p. 27, now has the effrontery to speak of this controversy as a threshing of empty straw, a contention about trifles ("a dispute about the emperor's beard").

determined zeal as the aged Polycarp and Polycrates, name a series of genuine ancient witnesses like that of the Church of Asia.¹ It is only somewhat weakened by the probability that the John to whom we refer was not the Apostle, but the so-called Presbyter of Ephesus.² But even if this does to a certain extent tarnish the brilliance of the victory which Baur and Hilgenfeld have achieved against the so-called Gospel of the Apostle John by disclosing the genuine testimony of the Apostle John, the victory of the historical conception is still great enough if one or the other John, if simply the oldest attested names of the Church of Asia Minor, with a consciousness of fidelity to actual fact, become surety for the chronology of the last days of Jesus given by the ancient sources, and contradicted by the later Gospel of John. The weight of these facts is felt the more when, glancing backwards from the Easter controversy of Asia Minor to John and to the ancient Gospels, we ask on which side impartiality and disinterested fidelity are to be found. Here we see at once that the interest of the Gentile-Christian, the Western, the Roman Church, was—as the Nicene Council and the emperor

¹ Eus. 5, 23, 25.

² The question of the Presbyter has been raised above, I. pp. 211 sqq., V. p. 53, n. 2; comp. *Prot. K.-Z.* 1868, pp. 535 sqq. See also, against the precarious representations of Steitz and Riegenbach (who publicly called himself refuter), the new and profound investigation by Holtzmann, *Bib.-Lex.* III. pp. 352 sqq. Max Krenkel, *Der Apostel Joh.* Berlin, 1871, pp. 133 sqq., in his acute attacks upon my position, adopts an untenable system of conceivable expedients. He is silent as to the death of John by the Jews (above, V. p. 53, n. 2). The strong counter-testimony against the fourth Gospel which lay in this Johannine tradition of Asia Minor, Wieseler has sought to weaken by his assumption that John harmonizes rather with the Synoptics (to whom he, Langen thinks, p. 68, must have made more than only a few antagonistic allusions); Bleek, with his opposite belief in the difference, by the hypothesis that John in his practice accommodated himself to the Christians of Asia Minor (*Bibl. in's N. T.* p. 193). Both attempts are futile—Bleek's, because John in the Gospel attaches great weight to his divergent view (John xiii. 1), and because it is vain to imagine that the custom of Asia Minor of celebrating the Jewish Passover with the Christian festival did not touch the question of the last celebration and institution by Jesus, therefore the question of date. On the contrary, the adherents of the practice of Asia Minor said: ἐποίησε τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χ. τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἔπαθεν. διὸ καὶ ἐῖ ὃν τρόπον ὁ κύριος ἐποίησεν, οὕτω ποιεῖν, Hippoly. *Chron. Pasch.* 1, 13. Hippolytus says quite as distinctly: οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ κατὰ νόμον πάσχα.

Constantine in his proclamation upon the subject most plainly admit—the complete dissociation of Christianity from Judaism.¹ But since it was half-Jewish to allow the Christian Easter to be dictated by the “people,” to keep the 14th upon whatever day of the week it might fall, to exalt the Passover meal of Jesus on the 14th to the rank of central point of the Christian solemnity, in fact to a non-fasting festival of joy despite the death and burial of Jesus, it was therefore preferred to make the independent and immovable Sunday of the resurrection of Jesus the central point of the Easter festival, and to make the Friday—reckoned, with the fourth Gospel, as the 14th—the day of Jesus’s death. By such an arrangement and by fasting on account of Jesus, it was sought to establish an antithesis and to put an end to the Easter of the Jewish Passover lamb.² The Gospel of John, an influential leader of this tendency, represented similar interests to those of the Roman Church.³ Only this Gospel went deeper—it had mystical as well as practical aims. It wished to set aside the Jewish Law, and to represent the death of Jesus as being at once the fulfilment and the abrogation of that Law. This was accomplished by the artificial transference of the death of Jesus to the 14th, and by the intentional, persistent, and violent transfusion of the idea of the Passover and of the Passover lamb through the whole of the Gospel.⁴ Among the Christians of Asia Minor, in the old Gospels, such tendencies are not

¹ Eus. *Vita Const.* 3, 18.

² Eus. *H. E.* 5, 23. ‘Ο λαός, Pölyer. in Eus. 5, 24; but at the same time, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ., ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ. On the other hand, μηδὲ ἔστω κοινὸν ἡμῖν μετὰ τ. ἐχθίστου τ. ἰουδαίων ὄχλου, Const. in Eus. *Vita Const.* 3, 18.

³ Baümlein, p. 170, well brings out the difference between the *tradition* of the Christians of Asia Minor and the *idea* of their opponents. On the other hand, Neander, p. 525, has not hit the mark when he says that, whether the Gospel was written by John or by another, the writer could not give circulation to *arbitrary assumptions*; it was not simply an arbitrary assumption, but an idea which only *thus* (this against Hase, p. 215) found a correct expression.

⁴ It is a strong assertion for Meyer to make, when in *his* way of speaking he says (*Apostelgesch.* 3rd ed. p. 16) that every calculation based upon the 15th of Nisan lacks *historical support* because it is opposed to the Johannine account!

discernible. Among the Christians of Asia Minor we might suspect Jewish tendencies if the congregations had been Jewish-Christian, but they were Gentile-Christian, and nevertheless they remained attached—through their fidelity, not because of any special aims—to their half-Jewish usage. The Evangelists do not exhibit, in their account of the 15th, the least trace of any tangible or conceivable special tendency. They cannot wish to increase the crime of the Jews by placing it on the feast-day, since they have altogether refrained from mentioning the feast-day. It must have appeared to the Evangelists themselves more rational that Jesus should have died on the 14th instead of on the 15th; yet they retained the 15th, and that because, here as elsewhere, they spoke the language of fact, the tradition of unadorned truth.

2.—*The Year.*

The day of the week and the day of the month on which Jesus died therefore remain firm: he died on Friday, the 15th of Nisan. But the most important particular remains—the year; and a less important, the calculation of the 15th of the Jewish Nisan according to our calendar for the year required. Now we do not possess in the Gospels a concise and plain account of the year of Jesus's death. For, despite an error that was held for centuries down to Sanclemente, no one any longer doubts that Luke's notice of the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius refers simply to the commencement and not to the end of Jesus's ministry; and even if it were established that Jesus had altogether laboured one year, or even from two to three years, nothing would be gained by the addition of these years to those of the emperor (August, A.D. 28-29), therefore by the fixing upon A.D. 29, more correctly A.D. 30, or (according to John) A.D. 31-32, for the year of Jesus's death, because the alleged year of the commencement of his ministry is probably calculated only from the procuratorship of Pilate, and possesses little claim

to exactness and correct definition.¹ Nor is clear information otherwise obtainable, even indirectly, from either the Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles. We go to the Fathers in vain for help. The darkness on the day of death awakes a fleeting hope, especially when, with the Fathers, we place it by the side of Phlegon's eclipse of the sun; but we have already exposed this illusion, for Jesus certainly did not die at 11 a.m. or a little later on the 24th of November, A.D. 29.² We can base no calculation on the Pentecost of the apostolic time, the fiftieth day after the 16th of Nisan; and the conversion of the Apostle Paul, probably a year after the death of Jesus, more exactly A.D. 36, affords no certain evidence.³ Finally, the Fathers of the Church are kind enough to supply us with the year, month, and day, according to

¹ Luke iii. 1, comp. xiii. 7. Not only have the Fathers very generally (see below and II. p. 385), but even Sanelemente has, in his *Exercitatio chronol. de anno dominice passionis*, the appendix to his work *De vulg. æræ emendatione*, 1793 (above, II. p. 116, n. 2), reckoned from that date both the commencement of Jesus's ministry and the year of Jesus's death. In order to arrive at the result that that 15th year ad ipsius passionis tempus referendum, Sanelemente, naively found himself compelled to insert a point after the naming of the high-priests and before the appearance of John. Wies. *Syn.* p. 196; Zumpt, *Geburtsjahr.* p. 244.—Luke himself may have calculated the 15th year of Tiberius from Josephus's description—with which he might be acquainted (just as Tac. *Hist.* 5, 2—13, read Josephus's Jewish War)—of the procuratorship of Pilate, A.D. 26—36, even if the passage about Jesus had not yet been interpolated. At any rate, the evidence of the Gospel sources—which assumed an already longer duration of the procuratorship—and of the *ἐνστάσις* of the Jews, mentioned by Jos. 18, 3, 4 in., would suggest the insertion of the life of Jesus where it now stands (*Ant.* 18, 3, 3), *after* the struggle about the ensigns (18, 3, 1), and *after* the struggle about the conduit (18, 3, 2), in the third year of Pilate, who had come in the twelfth year of Tiberius (*Ant.* 18, 2, 2; Eus. 1, 9 sq.), that is in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, or A.D. 28.

² Above, p. 172. Further concerning Phlegon—whom critics for centuries past, even Bengel, have left alone—below, p. 224, n. 2.

³ Meyer, *Apostelgesch.* p. 44, holds it to be of moment that the Pentecost Sunday of the Church harmonizes with the Johannine chronology, according to which the 14th of Nisan was a Friday, the 16th a Sunday; on the other hand, in the Synoptics the 16th was a Sabbath, a Saturday, therefore the Pentecost-day was also a Saturday. It is well known that the sources say nothing concerning either Saturday or Sunday, the fact itself lies in doubt, and both Whit-Sunday and Palm-Sunday were late fixed by the Church. Latissimum spatium (pentecostes), Tert. *Bapt.* 19, comp. ib. *Idol.* 14: p. implere, and: tibi dies festus octavus quisque dies. Recently Noack, *Gesch. Jesu*, 4th book, 1871, p. 21, has been able to prove the year 37 from the rations at the Pentecost feast (chap. 2), to those belonging to the two legions of Vitellius! Paul, above, II. p. 399.

both the Egyptian and the Julian calendars. But they contradict each other. Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Julius Africanus, Lactantius, Augustine, Sulpicius Severus, give the 15th, in part also more correctly the 16th, year of Tiberius (A.D. 28—30), and frequently mention an apparently stronger guarantee of historical reminiscence, the Roman consuls of A.D. 29, C. Fufius Geminus and C. Rubellius Geminus.¹ On the other hand, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and others, fix upon the 18th or 19th year of this emperor (A.D. 31—33), which they at the same time, contrary to all history, call the 18th or 19th year of the reign of Antipas.² The Pilate literature gropes among the years A.D. 21—33.³ The days flit about in a similar motley dance. Ter-

¹ Tert. *Adv. Jud.* 8 (comp. *Con. Marc.* 1, 15): hujus (Tib.) XV. anno imperii passus est Christus. At the close, the consuls (comp. Tac. *Ann.* 5, 1) and the day. The same year Clem. *Strom.* 1, 21, 145. Jul. Afr. in Jerome upon Dan. ix.: usque ad annum XV. Tib. Cæs., quando passus est Christus. Orig. *Princ.* 4, 5: anno enim et aliquot mensibus docuit; ib. *Hom. in Luc.* 32: uno anno salvatorem in Judæa ev. prædicasse, et hoc esse, quod dicitur: prædicare annum domini acceptum. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 10: ejus anno XV. i. e. duobus Geminis coss. ante diem X. Cal. Apr. Judæi Christum cruci affixerunt. Ib. *Mort. Pers.* 2. Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 18, 54: mortuus est Chr. duobus Geminis coss. Sulp. Sev. *H. S.* 2, 27. Also the Chronographer of 354 (Gemini coss.), *Acta Pil.* exord., give in Rufus and Rubellio the same names. Different ἀκριβολογούμενοι (it is not quite plain whether they were chiefly Basilidians), give the 16th year in Clem. *Strom.* 1, 21, 146. Also Jul. Afr. in Eus. *Dem. Ev.* 8, 390, inclines the same way; also Origen, who, in *Princ.* 4, 5, adds several months to the one year. Comp. also Lipsius, pp. 21 sqq.

² Eus. *Chron.* ed. Sehæne, p. 148: ἐπὶ τ. πάθος προΐει ἔτει θ' τῆς Τιβ. βασιλείας, for which Jerome's version puts the eighteenth year: ad pass. venit a. Tib. XVIII. Epiph. *Hær.* 51, 23 (18th year). Oros. 7, 3. Comp. Lips. p. 22. The 18th year is given as that of Herod Antipas by Eus. *Chron. Arm.* and *A. Pil.* 19, Jerome, Epiphanius, Sulpic. Sev. 2, 27. The accession of Tiberius (A.D. 14) is erroneously taken to be also that of H. Antipas. Lips. p. 23.

³ Eusebius justly ridiculed the Gentile *Acta Pil.* of his time (*H. E.* 1, 9) for giving the IV. cos. Tib. (21st year). The Christian *Acta P.* have in A. exord. sometimes the 15th year (C G), sometimes D E the 18th (like Jerome), or lat. codd. the 19th (like Eus.), Tisch. p. 204; in B the 18th, Tisch. p. 266. The latter reckonings, with which decisively Olymp. 202, 4, and the 19th year of Herod, as well as Eusebius, agree, are for Lipsius a ground on which to base the post-Eusebian origin of the *Acta*. According to my opinion, it is to be inferred from the fact that these dates are loosely prefixed in the exordium, and perhaps from Eusebius' polemic against the Gentile *Acta* (*H. E.* 1, 9), that only the present form of the *Acta* is post-Eusebian, the original *Acta* not containing any chronological definition. According to *Chron. Pasch.* I. p. 430, Pilate reported to Tiberius rather Gallo et Noniano coss. (A.D. 35).

tullian, and after him Augustine, as well as the "Acts of Pilate," give the 25th of March; Lactantius, the 23rd; Clement and those that are "exact," the 25th of Phamenoth (21st of March); and a number of other days are not wanting in Clement and others.¹

The principle of these calculations is yet more suspicious than their disagreement. Dr. Zumpt has recently adopted the opinion, anciently held by Augustine, and later shared in by Sanclemente, but already rejected by Paulus, the opinion, namely, that the mention by Tertullian and his successors of the consuls Geminus must rest upon a trustworthy written or oral source, perhaps upon the genuine despatches of Pilate.² This crude illusion is by no means dispelled by Augustine, of whom critics (Zumpt not excepted) are accustomed quite erroneously to say that he admits in plain words that the names of the consuls of the years of Jesus's birth and death have not been handed down. It is rather dispelled by Epiphanius, who mentions, or rather guesses, the names of all the consuls of the ministry of Jesus from the 15th to the 18th years of Tiberius. It is, however, chiefly dispelled by the notorious fact that the consulate of the Gemini exactly synchronizes—by no means a new and valuable discovery—with the 15th year of Tiberius, which Luke mentions as the year in which Jesus began his ministry, and that the

¹ Tert. *Adv. Jud.* 8 fin.: mense martio, temporibus paschæ (14th of Nisan), die VIII. Cal. April. Aug. *De Trin.* 4, 5: VIII. Cal. Apr. conceptus creditur Chr., quo et passus. Ib. *Civ. D.* 18, 54: most. duob. Gem. coss. VIII. Cal. Apr. Thus also *Actu Pil.* A. exord. (in other copies Epiph. found XV.). Also in Hippolytus's Easter cycle of 112 years, and the cycle of 84 years of the Latins, this assumption finds expression, Wies. *Syn.* p. 134. Ep. Pilat, a Tib. alleged to have been written immediately after the death of Jesus, is dated V. Cal. Apr. (March 28). Tisch. p. 412. More divergent, Lact. *Inst.* 4, 10: ante diem X. Cal. Apr.; and *Mort. Pers.* 2: post diem X. Cal. Apr. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 21, 146: τό τε πάθος αὐτοῦ ἀκριβολογούμενοι φέρουσιν οἱ μὲν τινες τῷ ἑκκαίδεκ. ἔτει Τιβ. Καίσ. φαμενῶθ κέ (25th of Phamenoth, i.e. 21st of March), οἱ δὲ φαρμοῦθι κέ· ἄλλοι δὲ φαρμ. ιθ' (25th, otherwise 19th, of Pham. i.e. April) πεπονθέναι τ. σωτήρα λέγουσι. Further variations in Lipsius, p. 27. The Valentinians (Ptolemy) XII. mense dicunt passum, Irenæus 2, 22, 1 and 5.

² Zumpt, pp. 272 sqq.: the day of Jesus's death is an invention by the early Christian; the year of his death is not an invention. On the contrary, Paulus, III. p. 777.

authors in question, from Tertullian downwards, have placed the Gemini and the 15th year of Tiberius in part directly side by side as the means of defining the year of Jesus's death.¹ Therefore, after mature deliberation we appear to arrive at the fact that the information possessed by the Fathers was simply the mention of the 15th year in Luke's Gospel, and that the statement about the consuls rests, not upon independent tradition, but merely upon calculation, upon the reduction of the 15th year of Tiberius to the register of the consulate.² This is the conclusion not only of Gutschmid and Lipsius, but even of Wieseler and Caspari. The Fathers fixed upon the 15th year of Tiberius—which in Luke is the year of Jesus's first public appearance, and not of his death—only because they, following the prevailing correct or incorrect belief in the merely one year's duration of Jesus's ministry, could regard the year of Jesus's first public appearance as that of his death, although an exact

¹ Aug. *De Doctr. Christ.* 2, 23: per Olympiadas et consulum nomina multa sæpe queruntur a nobis et ignorantia consulatus, quo natus est dominus et quo passus, nonnullos cœget errare. This passage, torn from its context (as Casp. p. 35, quotes 2, 28), and even then rebelling against a false interpretation, is generally made to mean (see Casp., and Zumpt, p. 274) that Augustine here asserts general ignorance of the consulates in question; to which Zumpt adds the fancy that he shortly before his death heard of the consulate of Geminus, and mentioned it in *Civ. Dei*, 18, 54. But in the passage under notice Augustine speaks only of the error nonnullorum, and praises rather the assistance of the historia gentium, by which much even in the Holy Scriptures, and particularly—as against the foolish opinion based upon John ii., that Jesus died in the 46th year—the duration of his ministry after the 30th year (and 15th year of Tiberius) liquidius certiusque colligitur. He thereby points particularly to the Gemini coss., of whom he naturally knew already through Tert. and Lac., and speaks of them not only in *Civ. Dei*, but also in *Trin.* 4, 5. Zumpt himself, p. 275, gives the fact respecting Epiphanius (who mentions in particular the Coss. of the year 30). Comp. my notice of Zumpt in the *Prot. K.-Z.* 1869, as well as Gutschmid in the *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1869. Wies. *Syn.* p. 389. Lips. pp. 21 sq.

² The great confusion concerning the consuls is again a confirmation of the fact that the ancients were without the guidance of a certain tradition. Not only does Epiph. *Hær.* 57, 23, mention Vinicius and Cassius Longinus (A.D. 30) instead of the two Gemini, or Malala, *Chron.* p. 310, Sulpicius and Sulla (A.D. 33), not only do the *Acta Pil.* place the Gemini, Epiph. Vinic., and Cass. Long., Malala Sulpic. and Sulla, in the 18th year of Tiberius (A.D. 32), but Epiph. and *Chron. Pasch.* also spread the Gemini over two consulates, in one the Gemini, in the other Rufus and Rubellius. Lipsius, p. 28.

calculation must even then have pointed at least to the consuls of the year 30.¹ Starting from the same point, though proceeding differently, Tertullian and his followers arrived at the 12th year of Tiberius as the year of Jesus's first public appearance, and Eusebius with his associates arrived at the 19th or 18th year of Tiberius as that of Jesus's death. They reckoned backwards or forwards from the 15th year three or four teaching years of Jesus, which were suggested by the fourth Gospel, and by still more misleading combinations from Josephus or Phlegon.² Finally, the day of the month, Tertullian's 25th of

¹ In Luke, notwithstanding iv. 19, which has been made a basis for calculation by later writers, there is no sufficient data to establish *his* assumption of an only one year's ministry. Comp. only xiii. 7, and the Johannine use of it by Wiesz. p. 311. We should necessarily arrive at the coss. of 30 (with Jul. Africanus, who, however, mentions only the 16th year of Tiberius, not the consuls who appear in Epiph.) instead of those of 29, because the 15th year of Tib. (August, 28-29) could not coincide with the début of Jesus until the spring of 29. Jesus's death would be at the earliest (since from August 28 to March 29 is not a year) in the spring of 30.

² Tert. *Marc.* 1, 15 (12—15th years); comp. Philaster, *Hær.* 58. Gaudentius Brix. *S. III.* pp. 45 sq. See my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 237. Eus., Jerome, Epiph., see above. Indebtedness to Phlegon (and to Thallus) is seen in Jul. Afr., who places Phlegon's eclipse of the sun as well as the death of Jesus in the 202nd Olymp. 2nd year, that is A.D. 29, more exactly the year from July A.D. 29 to July A.D. 30 (Fragm. in *Sync. Chron.*, above, p. 173, and in Eus. *Dem. Ev.* 8, 390: ὀλυμπιάδος διακοσιοστῆς δευτέρας ἔτος δευτέρου). Here Eusebius has laboured most carefully, and yet with a perfectly untenable result. In the *Chron.* ed. Schöne, p. 148, he appeals to Phlegon, the fourth Gospel, and Josephus. In John he finds τριετὴς χρόνος (of Jesus) μετὰ τοῦ ἔτους Τιβ., and thus arrives at the 19th year of Tib. (19'), that is Easter, A.D. 33, although three years from the 15th he could reckon only up to 31, at most (if he calculated the 15th not, or only, from Easter 29) 32. But from Phlegon he obtained the 4th (instead of the 2nd, as above) year of the 202nd Olymp. (thus in Jerome's vers., Armen., ap. Sync., according to which in the Greek τῷ δ' should be read instead of δὲ; comp. Anger, ratio 29, Wies. *Syn.* p. 387), that is July, A.D. 31-32, therefore Easter, A.D. 32. It is evident that, influenced by the three years of John, he has now given the 4th year of the 202nd Olymp., instead of the 2nd, given by Afr. and by Eus. himself before in the *Dem. Ev.* 8, 390; and this is the most intelligible explanation of the notorious variations respecting the 2nd and the 4th years of the 202nd Olymp. From Josephus he derives chronological details that are altogether erroneous. In his (somewhat later) *Hist. Ec.* 1, 10, he gives a somewhat different calculation from Luke, John, and Josephus. From Luke (iii. 1 sqq.) he borrows the 15th year of Tib. as the starting-point, and the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, though in such a way that, contrary to the meaning of Luke, he is thinking, not of a simultaneous, but of a successive possession of office by the two men. Then he gathers (again quite arbitrarily, and with a result as essentially erroneous as the calculation in the Gentile *Acta Pil.*, which

March, around which the other dates given arrange themselves as variations, is derived from a calculation of symbolical observances connected with natural phenomena, as we have already seen in the case of the day of Jesus's birth. It was not merely a day near the Jewish Passover, it was the day of the Julian spring equinox, from which the spiritual day, at first only equal to the darkness, was to commence its victorious encroachment on the darkness. Now, according to astronomical calculation, the Jewish Easter in A.D. 34 fell on the 25th March, but in A.D. 29 upon the 18th of April, a date which was approached only by the chronologists of Clement with their 19th or 25th of Pharmuthi. On the vaunted 25th of March, A.D. 29, the moon, far from being a Passover full moon, was in its last quarter.¹

It appears, then, that it is not possible to take the year of Jesus's death by storm; either it is not to be taken at all, or only by a slow and circumspect investment. First of all, it is certain that Jesus was put to death during the reign of the emperor Tiberius and when Antipas was tetrarch of Galilee. The emperor Tiberius is directly mentioned in connection with the year of Jesus's death, by a trustworthy Roman source, Tacitus, and indirectly by Luke. The time of the rule of Antipas is distinctly assumed by Luke, and really also by Matthew and Mark.² Tiberius reigned from the 19th of August, A.D. 14, until the 16th of March, A.D. 37; Antipas, from

he himself ridicules) from Josephus that between Annas's retirement from office and Caiaphas's assumption of it there lay οὐδ' ἓλος τετραίτης χρόνος, and this is then (combined with John) ὁ σύμπαρ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος διδασκαλίας χρόνος. By this calculation he arrives at A.D. 32, nay, 33. It may be incidentally mentioned as to Phlegon, that in recent times, since Bengel and Marius Lupus (Paulus, pp. 769 sq.), his testimony has been ignored, partly because of the uncertain numbers, and partly because of the difference of the event (exceptions, above, p. 173). Indeed, from Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 33, it appears probable that Phlegon gave no figure, but only mentioned the reign of Tib., or at most the Olymp., without mentioning the year (Anger). Lipsius, *Pil. A.* p. 23 (also Tisch. p. 205), thinks Olymp. 202, 4, is original; but this is, from all points of view, improbable.

¹ Comp. Ideler, *Handb.* II. p. 421. Wurm's *Tabellen.* Wieseler, *Syn.* pp. 135, 390.

² Tac. *Ann.* 15, 44 (above, I. p. 27, n. 1). Luke iii. 1 sqq., xiii. 31, xxiii. 7 sqq.; Matt. xiv. 1, xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6, vi. 14, xii. 13.

autumn, B.C. 4, until the spring of A.D. 39.¹ These data do not enable us to fix upon any definite point in these reigns; but, as to Antipas, Luke makes it apparent that his misrule had already lasted a long time.² But there are other indications. The Roman procurator is mentioned both by the Gospels and by Tacitus; and with him the Jewish high-priest Caiaphas. Pilate governed Judæa from the spring of A.D. 26 to A.D. 36; Caiaphas was high-priest A.D. 18—36.³ One certain point is here obtained at once. Jesus did not die later than A.D. 35, because Vitellius, the governor of Syria, deposed Pilate before Easter A.D. 36, and Caiaphas at the close of that feast.⁴

¹ Above, I. pp. 265, 273.

² Luke iii. 19, xxiii. 8, 12. Also Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 2, well says: *extremis tempor. Tiberii.*

³ Above, I. pp. 265 sq., II. p. 386. Pilate elsewhere mentioned, Acts iii. 13, iv. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 13; Ignatius, *Smyr.* 1; Irenæus, 5, 12, 5. The limits of his official career are found if we reckon for Val. Gratus, not spring 15—26, but autumn 14—25, when there will remain for Pilate only autumn 25—35 (to his deposition before the next autumn). Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 2; 18, 4, 2. Comp. the—on the whole correct—calculation of Eus. 1, 9 sq., as to the appointment of Pilate in the 12th year of Tib.; on the other hand also, Eus. 1, 10, the foolish calculation as to the ministry of Jesus between the last year of Annas and the first of Caiaphas.

⁴ This calculation—which H. Sevin, *Chronol. des L. J.* p. 23, has afresh established—has already been given in my *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 224 sqq., and above, II. p. 386, and at most can be disputed only in subordinate points. The definite assumption—which will further on be strengthened—is that the Easter festival attended by the legate Vitellius, in Jos. *Ant.* 18, 4, 3, is that of the year 36. Then, according to 18, 4, 2, Pilate had been deposed shortly before, in the first months of the year 36, but Caiaphas, according to 18, 4, 3, at the close of the Easter festival of 36. One might here plead for the possibility of the Easter of Jesus's death in 36 instead of 35, since the deposition of Caiaphas after the close of the feast would still allow of his fatal activity at the beginning of it (against Sevin, p. 23); indeed, the judgment after the horrible deed of the murder of Jesus would be more startling, because more speedy. And since Pilate must have acted together with Caiaphas, the assertion of Josephus that Pilate hastened to give account of himself at Rome in obedience to Vitellius and yet did not arrive at Rome (*Ant.* 18, 4, 2) until after the emperor's death (16th of March, A.D. 37), allows us to suppose that Pilate was not deposed until the autumn of 36 or even the beginning of the spring of 37, and that it is only the confusion of Josephus that has placed Pilate's deposition before the Easter of 36. But this supposition must be given up, because, also according to *Ant.* 18, 4, 2 (see above), Pilate was on the spot only until the spring of 36, Josephus distinctly representing the deposition of Pilate by Marcellus as the precursor of Vitellius's *personal* visit to Jerusalem in the Easter of 36; further, because it is quite conceivable that Pilate, deposed in the spring of 36, would postpone the breaking up of a ten years' residence as governor—during

According to all our evidence, we may not go far, if at all, beyond the year 35. Zumpt has recently asserted that we must

which time his wife is said to have been with him—and the unwelcome journey (*Ant.* 18, 4, 2) until the autumn of 36, in order perhaps then—*mari clauso* (*B.J.* 4, 9, 2; 4, 10, 2; 4, 11, 1 and 5)—to reach Rome in the spring, therefore in 37, by a land journey (*B.J.* 4, 11, 1) or by a careful coast voyage (*B.J.* 4, 9, 2) like that of Paul and the centurion Julius (*Acts* xxvii. 1 sqq.). But a sea voyage in February or on the 1st of March, 37, is not to be thought of. The *ἐπείγεσθαι* of Josephus remains alone to be explained, but it presents much less difficulty than the historical narration as a whole. To sum up, the Easter of 36 could not have been that of the death of Jesus, not only because the 15th of Nisau in that year probably (see Wurm) fell on a Sunday or a Monday instead of a Friday, but chiefly because Jesus would then have been executed in the presence of the Syrian legate, of whom there is however no trace.

Among the divergent calculations (comp. above, I. p. 265) besides that of Zumpt (p. 296), who without evidence places the deposition of Pilate in the January of 37, there is particularly to be mentioned the recent one of Hitzig, who, in his *Gesch. des Volks Israel*, 1869, pp. 567 sq., 578 sqq., places the deposition of Caiaphas at Easter, 37; that of Pilate towards the end of the year 36; the death of Jesus at Easter, 36; his ministry, 35—36; the death of the Baptist between Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles, 35. Though it is pleasant to find this calculation approximating to mine, yet I cannot assent to it; and Sevin, pp. 21 sqq., has also given a just and detailed judgment against it. Moreover, Hitzig (*Mark.* p. 211) formerly calculated quite differently (Pilate's deposition before Easter, 36). Decisive is the calculation of the feasts, *Jos. Ant.* 18, 4, 3, and 18, 5, 3 (above, II. p. 386, note), which Hitzig distinguishes as the Easter and Pentecost of the year 37. But in the second passage (to say nothing of *Tac. Ann.* 6, 32—44, comp. with *Ant.* 18, 4, 4 sq.) the feast is much more probably Easter (thus also Sevin and Gerlach) and not Whitsuntide, as would follow from the fact that Vitellius, who had been peremptorily bidden by Tiberius (probably in the autumn of 36) to march against the Arabians, could not have first opened that campaign from Jerusalem at Whitsuntide after a gracious celebration of the feast. Add to this that the news of the death of Tiberius (16th of March, 37) would not require eight or ten weeks to reach Jerusalem, but only fourteen days (*Clem. Rec.* 1, 12), at most three or four weeks; comp. Hitzig himself, p. 583, according to whom the news of the death of Caligula (24th of January, 41) had reached Jerusalem on the 22nd of February; thus also Sevin, p. 22. Still less plausible is the supposition that the Easter of 37 is the feast mentioned in *Ant.* 18, 4, 3. In the first place, Josephus places these feasts so far apart that the time from Easter to Whitsuntide is by no means sufficient, but a year at any rate is required, since the second feast must fall in the beginning of the year 37, and the first cannot fall upon an Easter before that of 36, for Vitellius, the Easter guest in Jerusalem, did not go to Syria until the summer of 35 (above, II. p. 386, note). In the second place, the narrative in *Ant.* 18, 4, 2 and 3, clearly determines the date of the arrival of Vitellius, who protects the Samaritans against the arrogance of Pilate and enters Judea with pomp (*ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἰ.*; *δεχθεὶς μέγαλοπρεπῶς*): this points to 36, not to 37. In the third place, it is in the highest degree improbable that Vitellius visited Jerusalem twice in the year 37, in the course of seven weeks, and that, having at Easter appointed Jonathan the successor of Caiaphas, he seven weeks afterwards deposed him (*Ant.* 18, 5, 3). Though Hitzig (p. 578) here introduces the interesting explanation that Jonathan, in the absence of

go back at least to the year 32, and if possible still further, because the complete silence of the Jews and of Pilate, even of Luke also in his list of the rulers of Palestine, concerning the governor of Syria, the superior even of the Jewish procurator, clearly points to a time in which there was no governor present in Syria, a circumstance which happened between A.D. 20—32, when the governor L. Ælius Lamia was detained in Rome by the emperor.¹ This position, although advocated somewhat differently by Sevin also, is quite untenable. Not only, according to Zumpt's own but erroneous calculation, would the year afterwards advocated by Sevin—A.D. 34-35—remain open, as after the alleged death of the governor L. Pomponius Flaccus (end of

a procurator, carried out the execution of Stephen, and was on that account—like Annas the younger, at a later date (A.D. 63)—speedily deposed, yet the introduction of Stephen here is a mere hypothesis, Josephus makes the presence of a procurator (Marcellus) unquestionable, and it is impossible to explain the gift of the high-priesthood to the brother (*Ant.* 18, 5, 3) of a deposed high-priest who had been guilty of so flagrant a breach of law. Thus, if it remains that the first feast was the Easter of 36, it also follows that Pilate was deposed before the Easter of 36, and Caiaphas towards the close of the same Easter. These remarks apply also to the attempt which Noack, *Gesch. Jesu*, IV. 1871, pp. 13 sqq., has made to determine the year of Jesus's death. He admits my basis, but places the death of the Baptist late in the summer of 35, that of Jesus at the Easter of 37. He sees himself that this does violence to Josephus, but he supposes that the same Christian hand that interpolated into Josephus the passage about Jesus, also made certain chronological changes, mainly in order to separate Jesus from the seditious Samaritans (to whom he belonged). It is sufficient to answer that Josephus's unassailable statements as to the time the procurators remained in office (Gratus eleven years, 15—26; Pilate ten years, 26—36), *Ant.* 18, 2, 2, as well as what he says about the arrival of Pilate in Rome in the spring of 37, *Ant.* 18, 4, 2, forbid the extension of Pilate's term of office to the Easter of 37.

We may incidentally remark here that the most recent biographies of Jesus have very hastily passed over these questions. All have spoken of the limitation of date downwards afforded by the deposition of Pilate; but whilst Renan gets rid of both Pilate and Caiaphas before the Easter of 36, Strauss, in the 4th ed. I. p. 484, fixed the year 37 as that of the deposition of Pilate, but now, without further explanation, in his *New Life of Jesus* (Eng. Transl. I. p. 339) fixes the date after the Easter of 36. Hase (p. 20) and Weisse (I. p. 292) leave the choice open between 36 and 37; and Ewald, in his 2nd ed. pp. 33 sqq., fixed the deposition of Pilate and Caiaphas in 37, but in his 3rd ed. p. 86, he gives the year 36, though in pp. 92, 94, it stands 37. Strauss has taken no trouble to decide in which of the years 30—37 or 36 the death of Jesus occurred, whilst Renan (15th ed. p. 451) by a kind of accident falls upon the year 33. See below, p. 240, n. 2.

¹ Zumpt, pp. 262 sqq.

33) and before the arrival of Vitellius in the summer of 35, there was again a period without a governor; but the general idea that the procurator of Judæa, who had full jurisdiction over life and death and was able to carry out the execution of Jesus, needed in any way the co-operation of the Syrian governor, rests upon the profoundest ignorance of the whole history of Jewish procurators.¹ Rather, it seems clear that the execution of Jesus took place near the close of the procuratorship of Pilate. In the report of the trial of Jesus it is expressly stated that the procurator—that is here, distinctively, Pilate—was accustomed, according to Mark had *always* been accustomed, to release a prisoner; this one remark evidently points to the later years of Pilate's procuratorship.² Two things lead to the conclusion that the trial of Jesus was subsequent to the last conflict of Pilate with the people of Jerusalem, the dispute about the pagan shields in the palace of Herod: first, the generally reckless governor's remarkable anxiety in the presence of the people, an anxiety which all the Gospels, including John, disclose, and which was essentially the fruit of that collision—at first a fortunate

¹ Sevin (p. 34) calls Zumpt's remark most ingenious, and one that cannot be ignored in future attempts to determine the New Testament chronology. Only, instead of the year 29, which Zumpt mentions as the year of Jesus's death, Sevin chooses the year 34-35, in which it is also alleged there was no governor in Syria, and finds 35, his date for Jesus's death, which is on other grounds correctly fixed, thereby afresh confirmed. It will be afterwards shown that even then Pomponius Flaccus was in Syria as legate; but what is more important, and is also against Zumpt, is the most certain of all facts, that the Jewish procurator had free scope to act, that Philo and Josephus and Tacitus (*Ann.* 12, 54; *Hist.* 5, 9) mention a host of violent deeds and executions by procurators, and that Tacitus himself found the legality of the execution of Jesus established by the name of Pontius Pilate (above, I. p. 27). Comp. my critique on the three chronologies, in *Prot. K.-Z. l.c.* Another new idea of Sevin's is also untenable, that the parable in Luke xix. refers to Antipas's journey to Rome after the death of Philip, as to an event of quite recent occurrence (Sevin, pp. 17, 28). The supposition of Meyer and Holtzmann here remains the more probably correct, namely, that the word refers to Archelaus's journey to Rome, since the parable speaks of really receiving a kingdom (which Sevin wrongly denies), whilst in Antipas's case there was nothing in question but an addition or a title. Moreover, the whole surmise as to the object of this journey is a mere hypothesis, though a plausible one; and, finally, it is simply impossible to prove that Philip was already dead in 33, and that Antipas set out in the last months of that year.

² Matt. xxvii. 15; Mark xv. 8; comp. Luke xxiii. 12, 17.

one for the people—with Pilate; and next, the—certainly not altogether historical—notice by Luke of the conversion of the animosity between Antipas and Pilate into close friendship, a change wrought by the trial of Jesus, and which could not have occurred until at any rate a considerable time after Pilate's extreme irritation on account of Antipas's espousal of the cause of the people of Jerusalem in the matter of the heathen shields. But, as Philo plainly shows, the incident of the shields did not occur until after the fall of the imperial favourite Sejanus, the foe of the Jews (*ob.* A.D. 31), and after the imperial favour was again shown to the Jews; indeed, according to the same writer, it did not occur until nearly the close of the already crime-stained procuratorship of Pilate, between A.D. 32 and 35.¹

Thus the remarkable unanimity between the Gospels and Philo shows that the death of Jesus could not have taken place before A.D. 33—35, and that it was rather in the last of these years than the first. But conclusive proof is afforded by Josephus in those chronological data, concerning the death of John the Baptist and concerning the Jewish and Roman circumstances connected with that death, which have been discussed in detail in previous volumes, which have been again and again confirmed by renewed investigation and even by the objections of opponents, and which have been admitted by a series of impartial inquirers.² It is true that the calculation which fixes the death of John near the close of the year 34 (and all the evidences are against the year 35) has been most energetically contradicted by several;

¹ Luke xxiii. 12, and above, I. p. 307. Philo expressly relates that the four sons of Herod the Great, including at any rate Antipas, took the side of the people against Pilate before the emperor. An enmity, therefore, similar to that between Antipas and Vitellius a few years later (above, I. p. 272).

² See the appendix on the chronology of the life of Jesus, in my *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 224 sqq. Also above, II. pp. 379 sqq.: the Great Year in the World's History. Also, IV. p. 223. The history of the Herods in *Bib.-Lex.* III. pp. 44 sqq.; the three Christian chronologies, in *Prot. K.-Z.* 1869, pp. 1179 sq., 1214—1220. Holtzmann (1866), Hausrath (1868), Hitzig (1869), Overbeck, Schenkel, Sevin (1870), and even Noack (1871), essentially agree with the above. On the other hand, Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1871, p. 149, has passed over all these new investigations in silence.

but these have only shown that, even to-day, religious prejudice can be guilty of the grossest fanaticism as well as of the most extravagant caprice, to which latter category belongs the assertion by Wieseler and Zumpt that what they regarded as the divine vengeance—described by Josephus under A.D. 36—against the tetrarch Antipas, the murderer of the Baptist, by no means prevents us from thinking the murder of the Baptist to have been perpetrated many years before, and from interpolating many years between the insult offered to the Arabian princess and the revenge by her hot-blooded father. And lastly there comes Volkmar—in part following in the wake of Wieseler, and in part quite independent—destroying with a turn of the wrist the belief in the connection of the death of Jesus with that of the Baptist, and creating out of nothing a death-year of the Lord in which we are now to believe, although—a fact which he does not seem to know—it has long been obsolete.¹

¹ Wieseler, *Beiträge*, pp. 3 sqq., 16. Zumpt, pp. 241 sqq., 254 sqq. Volkmar, *Ev.* pp. 355 sqq., and the attack, p. 370. None of these works are lacking in courtesies; and Zumpt has spoken (p. 257) of the far greater discretion (more correctly, careless laxity) of Ewald, and of thoroughly untrustworthy conclusions, but Wieseler and Volkmar have made the worst charges. Wieseler (p. 11), with extraordinary civility, has accused me of unavowed dependence upon Karl Schrader; and Volkmar has the more boldly repeated this without quotation because—despite a declaration to the contrary—he has otherwise industriously copied Wieseler. See only Volkmar, pp. 356 and 370. The baseness of this charge may be seen by any one who has read the few poor and incorrect sentences of Schrader, Paulus, I. pp. 36 sq., and my citation of Schrader in *Gesch. Chr.* p. 235, particularly above, II. p. 386, where I expressly show my relation to my predecessors; or who has studied my writings enough to discover that I am always pleased to acknowledge indebtedness to my predecessors. But any one who has any judgment at all can understand that an author who delights to rely upon the original sources (as I preferred to do in my *Gesch. Chr.*) and not upon the assertions of later writers, a writer who begins with Josephus and not with Schrader—whose list of high-priests, governors, kings and emperors (pp. 3—35), could interest me, though, for me, pp. 36 sqq. had not existed—does not quote *primo loco* his “predecessors,” not even Wieseler, with whom I (to his and Volkmar’s consolation) was long ago acquainted, but was fain to put on one side. Not less objectionable is a malicious pleasure which Wieseler and Volkmar—again in the wake of Wieseler—experience in thinking that by the death of the Syrian legate, Pomponius Flaccus, in the year 33 (and nevertheless long after the marriage of Antipas and Herodias), my “new discovery and possession is at once demolished” (Volkmar, p. 370). I have already, above, II. p. 396, n. 1, refuted this prejudice, and in the face of the trouble I have taken, the cheap outcry of my opponents is simply frivolous. In the *Prot. K.-Z.* pp. 1216 sq., this point is afresh discussed, and, besides Flaccus, the Piso

The refutation of all the monstrosities of these representations, the collection of all the direct and collateral evidences for the

of Wieseler is also rendered harmless. Formerly I quoted only Tac. *Ann.* 6, 27, to prove the possibility and probability of a longer life of Flaccus (who was *never* a source of anxiety to me); but certainty can be arrived at, not by means of the well-known coins which do not go a step beyond the year 33, but by several further facts of Roman and Jewish history. According to Tac. *Ann.* 6, 11, 27, comp. Dio C. 58, 19, Flaccus first went to Syria as legate in the spring of 33 (at the very earliest possible in the autumn of 32); but Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 6, 2 and 3, compels us to assume a longer term of office, and to extend that term to the year 35, because he is placed parallel with Arruntius, the legate of Hither Spain from 25 to 35 (Tac. *Ann.* 6, 27; 4, 13, 45), and because he was succeeded by the legate Vitellius (Volkmar always speaks of *proconsuls*, even of a *proconsul Quirinus*!) in the summer of 35 (Tac. *Ann.* 6, 32).

When I regard the above attacks in the light of results arrived at by the assailants themselves, I am only afresh amazed at those attacks. According to Zumpt, to his own astonishment (p. 261), the Jewish-Arabian war could follow the disgrace of the daughter of the Arabian king after an interval of twenty years (A.D. 15—35), and according to Wieseler after eight years (A.D. 29—36)—an insult to Josephus! Even Weizsäcker and Hilg. (*Zeitschr.* 1871, p. 149) have a taste for this dilatory system. When it is pleaded that Josephus himself separates the ἀρχὴ ἔχθρας and the outbreak of the war, the first glance at the passage exposes the sophistry; for in reality the initium dissidii is immediately followed by action: Aretas at once breaks with Antipas, brings on the controversy about the boundary, collects troops, and strikes the blow: *initium belli*. And what then, finally, are the critical and chronological results of Volkmar, who speaks (p. 370) in a lofty tone of the “tolerably satisfactory researches” of Wurm, Anger, Wieseler, results to which (at least Hilgenfeld has found them worthy of consideration) some attention is still to be devoted? (1) The death of John occurred neither during the ministry of Jesus, nor during the married life of Antipas and Herodias. (2) It occurred before both of these. (3) The death of John occurred about the year 30, the death of Jesus in 31—33, probably in 33. (4) Since Mark, the poet, wrote forty years afterwards (Mark i. 13), the Gospel of Mark was “undoubtedly” given to the world in (about) the year 73 (Volkmar, pp. 355 sqq., comp. pp. 50, 442, 646). How is all this proved? As to (1), John was, according to Mark i. 14, “given up” and “beheaded” (Volkmar, pp. 67, 357) before the public appearance of Jesus; see upon this view, which is quite unhistorical and in direct conflict with Mark i. 14, vi. 14 sqq., above, IV. p. 222, n. 2. As to (1) and (2), according to Josephus, John was beheaded at Machærus, the fortress of Antipas’s father-in-law by his first marriage, a fortress to which Antipas had access only during the time of his friendship with that father-in-law, therefore only during his first marriage and before his marriage with Herodias, and *never afterwards*. Here it is not taken into consideration that Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 5, 1, distinctly assumes a change of ownership of Machærus, mentioning the Arabian as being at the time of his daughter’s flight to Machærus as the *then* (τότε) possessor of the fortress; that, in *Ant.* 18, 5, 2, he represents the fortress as the possession of Antipas at the time of the arrest of John (how can any one suppose that he sent a prisoner to a *foreign* stronghold?); that the war between Antipas and the Arabian began with disputes as to boundaries in the Galaaditis (as it should be read, instead of Gamalitis; see *Prot. K.-Z.*), which might have had the result of the capture of the ancient Jewish border fortress by Antipas (as it appears to many others also); further that Machærus actually passed from Jewish into Arabian,

death of the Baptist in the winter 34-35, must not be repeated here; and those readers who wish to go into these questions are referred to the controversial articles in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*. Only two arguments in addition to those already given can find a place here. The occurrence of Antipas's reverse in battle, in the year 36, immediately after the murder of the prophet, is required by the whole style of the narrative of Josephus, who, in the most vivid tone of the present, connects the ground of the divine judgment with the mention of that judgment, in the words, "For Herod slays him, the Baptist, a good man," words which no one can transform into the sentence, "For Herod had slain the Baptist many years before." A second proof stands close at hand: Josephus describes a second divine judgment upon Antipas. Upon the deposition of Antipas by the emperor Caligula in the spring of 39, the consequence of the ambition of Herodias, he remarks that God imposed this punishment upon Herodias's envy and Antipas's weakness. Though the author inserts no "immediately," as he does elsewhere, nevertheless he here also thinks of such a speedy punishment as is implied in the idea of a divine judgment and in the popular conception of such a judgment; for it was not until

from Arabian again into Jewish and Roman hands, and, after being a stronghold of the Jewish revolution, was once more taken by stratagem by the Romans in the year 71; finally, that a long series of instances of taking possession by force and stratagem, or by capitulation, is recorded, as has been copiously shown above, II. pp. 337 sqq., but Volkmar has overlooked all this. As to (3), the only reason given for fixing the death of John in the year 30 is, that Machærus was not at the disposal of Antipas after his breach with the Arabian, which breach is said to have been connected with a journey by Antipas to Rome *apparently after the death of Livia* (A.D. 29). A thoroughly untenable, Wieseler-like hypothesis, which has been already refuted above, II. p. 392, n. 2. Volkmar might have much more reasonably based the date of the death of the Baptist upon the battle with the Arabian in 35 (as he says). For the death of Jesus in the year 33 no ground at all is given, except perhaps the indistinct reminiscence of the wrong reckoning of Eusebius; and even if it be assumed that the death of John occurred in the year 30, there remain open all the years between 31 and 36, particularly as such historical criticism essentially removes the immediate connection between John and Jesus. But if the year 30 for the death of John falls away like a house of cards, what becomes of Jesus? One house of cards is built upon the other, and "undoubtedly" Mark wrote forty years (what a dream!) after the year 33, that is, in A.D. 73!

after the winter of 38-39 that the obnoxious envy and ambition of Herodias found expression.¹ Hence the late date of the death of the Baptist—at the earliest, in the autumn of 34—remains altogether unshaken; as to the death of Jesus, there is therefore no alternative but to fix it at the Easter of 35, a date which places it in a correct relation to the Baptist's death, because according to the clear statements of the Gospels the Baptist's death preceded that of the Lord by at most not more than several months.²

It is true that this supposition is not without several trifling difficulties. The first lies in the fact that the period for the ministry of Jesus between his first public appearance in the spring of 34 and his crucifixion in the spring of 35, appears to be too short. Certainly the wealth of occurrences which the Gospels crowd into the ministry of Jesus, harmonizes better with the two or three years of the fourth Gospel than with the one year. But a great epoch-making life is—as Origen saw, and as Cicero said to the praise of Alexander the Great—independent of mere measurement by time. With its spirit of eternity it fills, by its own activity and its awakening influence upon others, one year in a way in which an ordinary life does not fill a long series of years; and it succumbs the more quickly to the antagonistic

¹ Jos. *Ant.* 18, 5, 2; 18, 7, 2. A literal "immediately," *Ant.* 14, 2, 1 and 2. Hitzig and Sevin, in particular, have assumed the most speedy sequence of sin and divine punishment. Contrary to such "crude fancies," Zumpt and Wieseler find that both cause and effect cannot be pressed into the time. Has not Josephus (Zumpt gratefully borrows from Wieseler this example out of *Ant.* 20, 8, 5) connected the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 with the murder of Jonathan in the fifth decade? Instead of this inappropriate example (Josephus does not speak of Jonathan merely, but of all the horrors of the Sicarii down to the year 70), I have better placed at their disposal the *εὐθὺς* of Hegesippus and Eus. (2, 23) with reference to the murder of James (A.D. 63) and the punitive destruction of Jerusalem; also *παρὰντίκα* (Eus. 1, 8) and *οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν* (Eus. 2, 6), which, however, prove nothing at all, because in a general bird's-eye view centuries after the events a writer can connect things that lie far apart, but the instinctive and immediate popular verdict must find but a little interval between crime and punishment, in order to believe in the operation of the finger of God. Comp. also 2 Chron. xxiv. 22 sqq.

² This is proved by all the indications of time, from Matt. xiv. 8 sqq. downwards. Comp. only Matt. xvii. 24. Death of the Baptist, above, IV. pp. 223 sqq.

forces of the past the more brilliantly it shines and the more mightily it moves the world—particularly in the midst of that Judaism which we feel to be itself only when it can endure the Baptist and Jesus for scarcely a year.¹ And if we cast an unprejudiced glance—as even Eusebius succeeded in doing—at the sources from which modern critics have been impelled by various motives to seek to supplement the poor comfort of our ignorance concerning the duration of the ministry of Jesus, we shall find that those ancient sources, although they give no express information upon the duration of that ministry, make it difficult to cut the work of Jesus into only a hundred days' work, instead of into three and four hundred. Nay, by placing the Baptist's death in the midst of the life-work of Jesus and at the opening of the quickly-developing drama of Jesus's persecution, those sources suggest, not years of ministry, but only months, before the last passion of Jesus.² If it be said that this measurement by the matter and the chapters of the sources is inexact, that the history of the passion is evidently narrated with the greatest copiousness, and the Galilean beginnings only compendiously, it can on the contrary be established that no such great difference in the narration of the beginning and of the end exists as to give room for that period of a year, and moreover to suggest the assumption of very great condensation in the author. To all this is to be added that we find not the slightest trace of a series of years

¹ Orig. *Princ.* 4, 5. Above, I. p. 3. Cic. *Philipp.* 5, 17, 48: Alex. died at the age of 33, ten years too young for the consulate: ex quo judicari potest, virtutis esse quam ætatis cursum celeriorum.

² From a harmonistic tendency or from pessimism, critics have been accustomed to reduce the evidence of the three Gospels as to the duration of Jesus's ministry to nothing. Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 482; *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 337; Weiss, I. p. 290; Neander, 192; Weiss, pp. 306 sqq. Also Volkmar. Scholten, *Ælt. Ev.* p. 180, thinks that the atomizing Mark, in contrast to the chronologic Matt., helps to extend the Galilean and Jerusalemite ministry of Jesus. This must needs be after the restless *καὶ* and *εὐθὺς* of Mark. On the other hand, Eusebius (3, 24)—who was so far impartial—found in the Synoptics only one year, although he himself, with the fourth Gospel, believed in three or four years, and took great pains to remove the discrepancy. Gess (p. 275) has recently claimed three quarters of a year for Jesus' career from Cæsarea to his Passion. Before that one year (p. 276) or even five quarters (p. 351), makes two years.

and of a passing from one year to another, of feasts and of visits to feasts undertaken or neglected, about which something might have been expected had Jesus's ministry lasted several years, but nothing if it lasted only one. On the contrary, we find merely notices of the early summer, of the late summer, of the autumn, and then of the early spring, as well as of an absolutely *first* visit to Jerusalem on the occasion of the well-known entry. Last and weightiest, we find that while the Galilean ministry of Jesus fell actually and mainly between the arrest and the execution of the Baptist, the interval between these two incidents, according to the clearest testimony of Josephus—a testimony in harmony with the Gospels—was at most only several months, and not a year.¹ Against this evidence of the ancient sources, the later source of the fourth Gospel has no weight, because we know the unhistorical grounds from which the extension of the ministry of Jesus to two or three years flows as a necessary consequence: viz., the striving after a copious diversity and vicissitude by means of repeated festival journeys and restless wanderings from north to south, the desire to give equal prominence to Galilee and Judæa, and the intention of exhibiting by a three-fold Passover the development of the holy, sanguinary mystery of the Passover lamb.² Finally, the attempt to rely upon John as

¹ Weizsäcker asserts (p. 308) that there are no, not even indirect, traces that Jesus's last journey to Jerusalem was his first visit. He and others (comp. Bleek, *Beitr.* pp. 94 sqq.) adduce a series of traces of the opposite, not one of which will bear a moment's examination, as, for example, Luke xiii. 7, which passage is made to point to four years (comp. Sevin, p. 11). Again, Riggensbach's renewal of Neander's appeal (p. 193) to Luke vi. 1 is quite invalid; see above, I. p. 177, n. 3; III. p. 363. With reference to the visit to Jerusalem, not only are the passages Mark x. 32, xi. 11 neglected (despite a partiality for this Gospel in other respects), but Matt. xxi. 10 and xxiv. 1 are altogether overlooked. The indications of summer and spring, above, III. pp. 10 sq. Lastly, Matt. xvii. 24, xxiii. 27, xxiv. 32. John the Baptist, see above, II. pp. 332 sqq. Josephus here makes (*Ant.* 18, 5, 2) the execution follow so soon after the arrest, that Volkmar (p. 355) now again admits no delay, such as the Gospels require yet themselves limit so far as to show the animosity of Herodias and her lying-in-wait simply on the given *day*, Matt. xiv. 3 sqq.

² If we look for a Passover feast in John v. 1 (as several manuscripts read, and as is assumed by Irenæus, Eusebius, down to Luther, Neander, Hengst.), Jesus's ministry includes four Passover feasts (John ii. 13, v. 1, vi. 1 sqq., xi. 55, xii. 1), and Jesus

to this point is unintelligible, if, with most modern critics, we must decide to renounce willingly or unwillingly in favour of the earlier sources the thoroughly arbitrary representation by this author in the co-ordinate question of the day of Jesus' death.¹

This interference with the genuine tradition finds also a very weighty opponent in the testimony of the ancient Church, which with almost complete unanimity upholds the one year's ministry of Jesus. Attempts have been made to weaken the force and the character of this testimony by trying to find in the one year simply an emblematic realization of the "acceptable year of the Lord" in Isaiah, given as Jesus's text in Luke's account of his first appearance as a teacher.² Certainly once in the Fathers,

then laboured for (comp. ii. 1—13) three years and several weeks (recent critics speak of months). But it is best to assume, with Kepler, Hug, Anger, Wieseler, Meyer, and others (comp. above, III. p. 215, V. p. 73), the Purim feast (Hitzig: Pentecost; Noack: feast of tabernacles), because the Samaritan-Galilean sojourn of Jesus (John iv.) is expressly placed in the winter (iv. 35) and is of brief duration, the sojourn at the feast in Jerusalem, v. 1 sqq., is speedily transformed into a flight, immediately upon which, vi. 1, the Passover appears. Between iv. 35 and vi. 1 there cannot be a period of sixteen months. Moreover, this feast is called a feast, not the feast, and between winter and the Passover there lies only the perfectly suitable Purim feast. *Then according to John the ministry of Jesus lasted only two years and a few weeks, a simple duplication of the earlier report.* Thus already Hug, *Eint.* II. p. 207; recently Credner, Strauss, Friedl., Hase, Wies., Langen, Beyschlag, Sevin, Noack, and others; on the contrary, with John v. 1, Irenæus, 2, 22, 3, three years; Eus. 1, 10, three to four years. Recently Paulus, p. 778: John and Jesus each from two and a half to three years; Wieseler, *Beitr.* p. 166, two and a half; Gess, pp. 275 sq., two; Weisz. pp. 306, 315, at least three; Ewald, pp. 199, 317, also Neander, Hengst. (Wies. p. 160), three and a half; Weisse, pp. 291 sq., 298, 329 (it would seem, also, Scholten, p. 180), several years; Renan, 15th ed. p. 451, six years (A.D. 28—33).

¹ Thus particularly also Weizsäcker, p. 560, comp. *ib.* pp. 305 sqq.

² Objection is exhausted in the assertion: "This view is without any historical basis" (Weizs. p. 306). Already Irenæus, 2, 22, 5, spoke of the figmentum of the Valentinians; the prophet spoke parabolically, annus was tempus. Similarly Strauss, 4th ed. I. pp. 481 sq., and the recent Wieseler, Zumpt, Volkmar. Upholders of the view of one year among the ancients: Clem. *Hom.* 17, 19: διὰ τὶ ὅλῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐρηγοροῦσι παραμείνων ὠμίλησεν ὁ διδάσκαλος; *Recog.* 4, 35. Valent. (Ptolem.) ap. Irenæus, 1, 3, 3: XII. mense passus est: uno enim anno volunt eum post bapt. prædicasse; 2, 20, 1; 2, 22, 1: XII. mense dicunt eum passum, ut sit anno uno p. bapt. prædicans et ex propheta tentant hoc ipsum confirmare. Clem. *Strom.* 1, 340: ὅτι ἐνιαυτὸν μόνον ἔδει αὐτὸν κηρῶσαι καὶ τοῦτο γέγραπται ἐνιαυτὸν δεκτὸν κυρίου κηρῶσαι ἀπίστευλὲν με, τοῦτο καὶ ὁ προφήτης εἶπεν καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. ἰέ οὖν ἔπει

when Jesus's one year is mentioned, the prophet is referred to; and it might hence be surmised that this was also the unexpressed point of view when the one year is propounded without an appeal to the prophet.¹ However, as soon as we look more closely, we readily perceive that the tradition was independent of the prophetic passage, but subsequently laid hold of this as a welcome illustration. In fact, the one year is repeatedly mentioned without any introduction of the prophetic passage, and even where that passage appears it is as an illustration, not as a proof.² Further, the Clementine Homilies speak of the Lord's teaching year, though they cannot be certainly shown to have made use of Luke, the supposed chief source of the error.³ Finally, when the Homilies give distinctly one full year of quiet teaching intercourse of Jesus with his disciples, and Origen gives

Τιβερίου καὶ ἐ' Ἀγούστου οὕτω πληροῦνται τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη, ἕως οὗ ἔπαθεν. Tert. *Adv. Jul.* 8 : XV. anno imperii (Tiberii) passus est Christus, annos habens quasi XXX. cum pateretur. Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5 : indicium autem effusæ gratiæ in labiis ejus hoc est, quod brevi tempore transacto (anno enim et aliquot mensibus docuit) universus tamen orbis doctrina et fide pietatis ejus impletus est. Ib. *Hom. in Luc.* 32 : juxta simplicem intelligentiam ajunt, uno anno salvatorem in Judæa ev. predicasse, et hoc esse, quod dicitur : prædicare annum domini acceptum. Jul. Afr. ap. Jerome on Dan. ix., also ap. Eus. *Dem. Ev.* (see below) : exinde usque ad annum XV. Tiberii Cæs., quando passus est Christus, numerantur anni LX. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 10 : cujus anno XV. i.e. duobus Geminis coss. ante diem X. Cal. Apr. Judæi Christum cruci affixerunt. Thus also ib. *Mort.-Pers.* 2. Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 18, 54 (mort. duob. Geminis coss.), and 22, 15 (thirty years old when he died). Hilgenfeld, in his review of Bleek's *Beitr.* in the *Hall. Allg. Lit. Z.* 1847, p. 659, first laid stress upon this ancient testimony; later, Baur, *Evan.* p. 363. Baur is sceptical in his *Church History*, Eng. trans. I. p. 41, note. Recent writers, see below.

¹ Reference to the prophet (Isaiah lxi. 1 sq., comp. Luke iv. 19), Clem. *Rec.* 4, 35 : ispe enim est annus Dei acceptus, nos apostolos habens XII. menses. Val ap. Iren. 2, 22, 1 : see previous note. Clem. Al. *ib.* Origen, *Hom. in Luc.* 32. No reference to the prophet, Clem. *Hom. l.c.*, Tert., Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5, Jul. Afr., and following writers.

² Thus Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5, but also *Hom. in Luc.* 32, where the expression juxta simplicem intelligentiam is not exactly a renunciation of the usual explanation of the one teaching year by the prophetic passage, but only the antithesis to a still sublimer exposition (quiddam sacramenti).

³ *Hom.* 17, 19. It is well known that Credner, Zeller, and others, have referred this quotation to an extra-canonical Gospel; Hilgenfeld and Volkmar prefer to think of such a source rather than of Matthew and Luke. We must therefore say merely that it was, apart from Luke, a favourite Jewish-Christian idea, and indeed the Valentinians refer, not to Luke, but only to the prophet.

a year and several months, are these statements mere outgrowths of the one prophetic year, or are they not ancient Jewish-Christian traditions? And would not these authors and the Christians generally have been heartily glad to give up the brief prophetic one year in favour of a more prolonged *cyclus* of the ministry of Jesus, if the latter had had any existence at all in tradition?¹ It should be remembered that the tradition is a primitive one, and that it can be traced back to the middle of the second century, to a time when *our* Gospels were by no means universally adopted or had been critically examined. It is to be found at the most diverse points and among all parties in the Church, and not—as some have said—first among the proscribed Gnostics. It was able to hold its ground against the force of the antagonistic Johannine assertion, for centuries, from the times of Clement and Tertullian down to those of Augustine and his successors, so that even the friends and defenders of the fourth Gospel were obliged more or less openly to adhere to it. This strong testimony renders contemptible the commonplace explanation from a prophetic passage which even Irenæus held to be a doubtful source, or from Luke's Gospel which never had any very great deference paid to it, an explanation in fact resting upon one epidemic error. Whatever else it may prove, it establishes the existence of a sound historical basis, the full worth of which is further disclosed by the fact that an unbiassed investigation of the Gospels and an unbiassed chronology—verily, a remarkable inartificial triplet—lead to the same end, and join it in excluding all other possibilities.²

¹ *Hom.* 17, 19; Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5; see the passage given above, p. 237, n. 2. Is this to be derived *recta* from the Valentinians? (see same note).

² Weizs., p. 306, following Irenæus, finds it first held by the Valentinians; but Clem. *Hom.* 17, 19, is at least an equally ancient independent authority, and exhibits an undoubted belief in it. The elaborate refutation by Irenæus exposes the solid ground of the matter, and Eus. 3, 24, agrees literally with the Valentinian sentence: post bapt. uno anno I. prædicasse. The persistence of the tradition is seen particularly in the authors who, following John, believe in three years and yet do not wish to give up the one year; such writers as, not Irenæus indeed, but Tertullian and later writers. Very striking is the agreement of this factor with the others: the Gospels

The other difficulty is one of astronomy and the calendar. For more than fifty years, Johann Friedrich Wurm, Professor of Mathematics at Stuttgart, attempted to determine the new and full moons of the Jews in the spring equinox of the years A.D. 28—36, and thus to obtain the year and the day of the 15th of Nisan, the day on which Jesus died.¹ According to this calculation—the principles and results of which are continually being afresh confirmed—the 15th of Nisan fell upon a Friday in the year 30, and probably in 34, but in 35 it fell upon a Wednesday.² This appears at one stroke to make the year 35, which we have arrived at with so much trouble, impossible; at any rate it suggests the advisability of a retreat upon the year 34, which the second volume expressly left open. Wieseler arms himself with the derisive cry: "In the year 35, therefore, the full moon stood still for two days."³

do not allow of two or three teaching years; Josephus excludes anything beyond the year 34-35. Among moderns, the one year, with the addition of a few weeks or months (as in Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5), is upheld by Hitzig, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 579; Sevin, pp. 20 sqq.; Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 275; I already in my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 236. Hitzig has, on his part, attempted to harmonize John with the earlier sources, as Köhler had already (Hase, p. 21), by holding that John gave only the time between two Passovers. In order to establish this, he is obliged to re-arrange the text, in which I cannot follow him. Comp. also Sevin, p. 4. Just as little can I (with Sevin, p. 3) accept the assumption of Hitzig (p. 548), that John ii. 20, by the 46 temple years, pointed to the year 35 as the time of Jesus. The calculation of the temple years is itself open to doubt (above, II. p. 379); but in particular John ii. 20 is not to be translated so as to mean that the temple had been finished 46 years. There is really nothing to be obtained from this passage for the life of Jesus. Either it says merely that the temple was finished about the year 27-28, under the procuratorship of Pilate (comp. Jos. *Ant.* 18, 3, 2), or at most it shows that the fourth Gospel, following Luke iii. 1, has calculated the alleged date of the Baptist and of Jesus in a new form (thus Gutschmid, against Zumpt, in the *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1869).

¹ The often-mentioned treatise in Bengel's *Archiv*, 1818, p. 293.

² All recent critics rely, with trifling alterations (Wies. *Syn.* p. 445), upon Wurm; and Oudemans, Professor of Astronomy at Utrecht, has confirmed him. See Chavannes, *Revue de Theol.* 1863, p. 221, in Caspari, p. 16. In the year 30, Wurm's Easter table shows Friday, April 7, for the 15th of Nisan; in the year 34, Thursday, March 25, or in case of an intercalary year, Friday, April 23. Renan can bring in the Eusebian year, 33, because he follows John in regarding the 14th of Nisan as the day of Jesus's death. This, in the year 33, is Friday, April 3. Renan's chief argument, 15th ed. p. 451.

³ *Beiträge*, p. 12.

A retreat upon the year 34 is, however, not to be undertaken, since our renewed investigation must have again shown the decisive superiority of the year 35.¹ On the contrary, against Wieseler's carnal security in the reckoning of the Jewish calendar, we may afresh mention the fact that the most experienced and careful investigators have cautioned critics against feeling secure in this matter, and that Wurm has spoken only of conjectural results, and Bleek of the extraordinarily small credibility of the alleged exact calculations.² Hence Anger has ventured to place the death of Jesus in the year 31, Hitzig in the year 36, and Zumpt in the year 29, although in none of these years does the 15th or even the 14th of Nisan, according to Wurm, show a Friday, but a Thursday and even a Sunday or Monday. Before we go any further it may be said that, in view of the notoriously imperfect and arbitrary character of the Jewish calendar, inaccuracy and irregularity are much more probable than the strict regularity of Wurm. And when we examine more closely, we discover at once a manifold possibility of error. The principle which Wurm laid down for the approximate determination of the Jewish Easter feast was as follows: From astronomical tables calculated for the meridian of Jerusalem, was reckoned the true astronomical new moon which immediately preceded the full moon that followed the spring equinox, the equinox in the first century being generally on the 23rd of March.³ To the date of the astronomical new moon thus found, was added from

¹ The point of view still remains: the closest possible proximity of the battle in 36 and the two-fold guilt of Antipas, as well as respect to the chronological tables of Josephus; above, II. pp. 389 sq.

² Wurm's title reads: *Astronomical Contributions to the approximate* (p. 279 has a similar term) *Determination of the Years of Jesus's Birth and Death*. On page 276 he says: We shall *perhaps not err very much*, if we . . . But there still remains an *uncertainty* as to one day, or even as to two, because we are not yet instructed with sufficient exactness concerning the actual procedure of the ancient Jews in this matter. This warning by Wurm, and a similar warning by Petavius (above, II. p. 399), do not exist for the daring of Wieseler. Bleek (*Beitr.* p. 148) said, concerning Wieseler's certainty, that he had an extraordinarily weak confidence in the trustworthiness of his astronomical calculations.

³ Wurm, pp. 279 sq.

24 to 48 hours, on the average a day and a half, to allow for the delay in detecting the new moon by the eye; this gave the Jewish new moon according to the visibility of the new light. When to this 1st of Nisan of the Jews 14 days were added, there was obtained the 15th of Nisan, or the day of the Jewish Easter feast. Here can be seen at once how uncertain is the determination of the decisive point of the visibility of the new moon, from the observation of which, and not from calculation, the Jews were accustomed to date the fourteen days later 15th of Nisan.¹ Indeed, a careful experimental investigation concerning the actual time of the first visibility of the new moon afforded to Wurm, and after him to Anger and Wieseler, the result that it could occur on the first, second, third, nay even fourth day after the astronomical new moon.² But since 48 hours was the mean time, and since waiting for the visible new moon must have a limit and, according to later accounts, was not prolonged by the Jews beyond the 30th—31st of the expiring month, when, even though no news had been received of its actual observation, the new moon or the 1st of Nisan was fixed and made known by beacons on the hills and later by messenger,—on these grounds Wurm ultimately found that *the danger of error might not be very great* if the interval between the Jewish new moon and the astro-

¹ Lightfoot, pp. 372, 201. Petavius, ii. 27, vii. 18. Paulus, III. ii. pp. 486 sqq. Wurm, pp. 270 sqq. Anger, p. 33. Wassermann, *Herzog*, X. p. 302. Also Wieseler, *Syn.* p. 439. Compare the objections of the Karaites, who would retain the ancient custom, to the later astronomical calculations of the Rabbanites, Paulus, pp. 487 sqq. In his *Beitr.* pp. 292 sqq., Wieseler—with Jost and Grätz—believes in astronomical calculations by the Jews already in the time of Jesus. This assertion is in direct conflict with the ancient evidences, according to which, long after the destruction of Jerusalem, the date was decided by the ocular view of the new moon by witnesses who were highly esteemed and whose credibility was severely tested. The Karaites expressly called the astronomical calculations *novæ et sub exilio hoc recentiori demum natæ*. Maim. *De novil.* c. 5: tempore, quo nullum est synedrium, non adhærent τῇ φάσει, &c. This testing of the witnesses is now thought to have been a mere formality, according to Jost only in appearance, the chief point being “secret rules”! In this way a guarantee is obtained, on the part of the Jewish historians and of Wieseler, for the trustworthiness of the ancient calendar.

² Wurm, pp. 270 sqq. Anger, p. 33. Wieseler, *Syn.* p. 479 (protests against Anger’s fourth day).

nomical new moon was reckoned as 24—48 hours.¹ Now, supposing it is quite correct that the Jews, at the end of a month, which they made to consist of 29—30 days, did not throw the calendar into confusion by waiting 3—4 days for the sight of the new moon, but simply decreed it and the beginning of the new month, it is nevertheless quite evident that through the numerous chances of human fallibility and even by intentional deception, which notoriously played a part in these observations, the determination of the new moon in the month in question as well as in the previous months might be materially retarded in comparison with the astronomical position, and thus the calendar new moon of the month of Nisan, consequently also the full moon, might not be decreed until the third or even the fourth day.² If in the year 35 the time of the true spring new moon was 6—7 a.m. on the 28th of March, then the new moon of the Jews *can* have been delayed beyond the 30th—when Wurm, following the general rule, fixes it—to the 31st, or even to the 1st of April; in that case the 15th of Nisan would fall, not on Wednesday the 13th of April, but on Thursday the 14th, or Friday the 15th. In this calculation we have not called in the aid of Caspari's remark, that since the Jewish day did not begin until the evening, whilst Wurm calculated from midnight to midnight, the Jewish week-day should as a rule be set a unit later; the alleged Wednesday would therefore have to be transformed into the fifth week-day, or Thursday, and the difference between the full-moon Friday in the year 35 and the full moon in Wurm's calculation would be brought down to only one day.³

¹ Above, V. p. 1.

² On doubtful, even deceitful, evidence as to the new moon (by minim, heretics, *Rosh hash. c. 2, 1*), see Lightfoot, p. 372. Paulus, III. ii. pp. 489 sq.

³ Caspari, pp. 16, 45. On the other hand, also Wies. *Beitr.* p. 162, where a want of exactness in Wurm's expression is admitted, whilst the custom of the Jews of reckoning the first day of the new month from the 30th of the expiring month, if the moon were seen on that day, thus making the expiring month contain 29 days, is rightly pointed out. But it is hardly to be denied that if the true new moon fell on the 28th of March, 35, at 6.19 a.m., the addition of only the minimum of 36 hours would make the visible new moon fall upon the evening of the 30th (after 6 o'clock), and that

Thus we may definitively maintain A.D. 35 as the year of Jesus's death, and may so far gratefully make use of Wurm's astronomical calculation as to mark the 15th of April as the day of Jesus's death. The surmises of recent investigators range between the years 27—37; and, as is usually the case, the very calculation which is historically and astronomically the most arbitrary—that of Eusebius—has, with the year 33, found the greatest number of defenders.¹ The year 35, first mentioned by Karl Schrader and now historically established, has a decided superiority over the literal and arbitrary calculations in scientific evidence, so far as such evidence is possible; and those who must have ancient and modern authorities may comfort themselves with such, or find repose in the fact that the much lauded Eusebian year has been in the most decisive manner overstepped.²

3.—*The Feast Calendar.*

In narrating, above, Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and his days of teaching there, we provisionally calculated backwards from

(before the destruction of Jerusalem) it was expressly ordained (*Rosh. hashanah*, c. 2, 4) that the nuncii not toto die usque ad vesperam acciperentur, but nonnisi usque ad Mincham (3—4 p.m.), at any rate not after the appearance of two evening stars, comp. Paulus, p. 490. Finally, what if the news of the new moon required more than 36 hours? Then at any rate the new moon's day would not be until the 31st of March, and the 15th of Nisan would be Thursday the 14th of April, not Wednesday the 13th.

¹ The year 29 (15th of Nisan, Monday 18th of April) is mentioned by Sandclemente, Ideler, Zumpt; the year 30 (Friday the 7th of April) by Bengel, Winer, Wieseler, Gumpach, Lichtenstein, Caspari, Pressensé; the year 31 (Tuesday the 27th of March, or Thursday the 26th of April), particularly Petavius, Vogel, Hug, Anger, Meyer; the year 33 (Saturday the 4th of April, or Sunday the 3rd of May), Ludwig Capellus, Scaliger, Usher, Spanheim, Pearson, Tillemont, Basnage, Michaelis, A. Pilgram, Heinrichs, Kuinöl, Feilmoser, Schott, Olshausen, Ewald, Grätz, Renan, Volkmar, and Hilgenfeld; the year 36 (Sunday the 1st of April, or Monday the 30th of April), Köhler, Hitzig; the year 37, Noack. The year 33 is appropriate only when we—with Renan—fix upon the 14th instead of the 15th of Nisan; the former fell upon Friday the 3rd of April.

² The year 35, Schrader, myself, Holtzmann, Hausrath, Sevin, Schenkel; slight difference of Ernst von Bunsen (year 34) and Hitzig (year 36). Even Paulus, p. 778, wished to have 33-34. Earlier evidence: the Jewish book Juchasin (35 years before the destruction) and the Epistle of Pilate, above, p. 221, n. 3; comp. II. p. 398, n. 2, and the tables in Meyer, *Einleitung zur Apostelgeschichte*, and Herzog, XXI. p. 552.

Friday the 15th of April, 35. Some further remarks are here required. Not one of the Gospels has furnished an exact and detailed diary of this last decisive period. The earlier Gospels give no clear data for the determination of the length of the sojourn at Jerusalem after the day of entry. This applies particularly to Luke. In Matthew and Mark, two or three days at the beginning, and the same at the end of the Easter time, stand out with some prominence, whilst the period between remains more obscure. A week spent at Jerusalem is certainly assumed by both, and this is not contradicted by Luke.¹ John appears at first to offer a more exact chronology, by describing the day of the entry into Bethany—he would have been more correct in saying into Jerusalem—as the sixth day before the Passover.² Since the Passover, particularly in this book, falls on the 14th of Nisan, the first day before the Passover is the 13th, the sixth the 8th of Nisan, and the 8th was therefore the day of entry. This day is in remarkable harmony with the assertion of Josephus, that in the year 66 the nation assembled at Jerusalem for the feast on the 8th of Xanthikos, that is, Nisan. It harmonizes also with the statements of the Synoptics, which fully allow this commencement of Jesus's seven days' visit, although very many recent critics have groundlessly held this period of labour

¹ Comp. Matt. xxi. 18, xxvi. 2, 17; Mark xi. 12, 19 sq., xiv. 1, 12. Very indefinite, Luke xix. 47, xx. 1, xxi. 37, xxii. 1; first definite, xxii. 7. Matthew allows a formal reckoning of 2 + 3 Easter-days, Mark (because of two-fold entry) 3 + 3, and Luke opens an indefinite *largitas*, which fully allows of both reckonings. Finally, John may have been guided in his mention of the date (xii. 1, Jesus's arrival six days before Easter) by Mark. Simply for the sake of showing the character of Mark's method, mention may be made of Scholten's (*Älteste Ev.* 1869, p. 81) assertion that, according to Mark, there is nothing to contradict Jesus's arrival some considerable time before the Passover feast, so that he may think of him as doing the work of a reformer for a longer period, whilst according to Matthew everything took place in the course of three days. But a formal reckoning finds in Matt. more than three days; and in Mark no one can introduce weeks and months between xi. 27, xiii. 1, xiv. 1. And how can we think that Jesus would have visited the very den of the hierarchy long before the feast, to be present at which formed his only purpose?

² John xii. 1. On the author's reason for placing the anointing of Jesus exactly a week before the Saturday of the burial, see above, V. p. 274.

at Jerusalem to be too brief.¹ Whether John derived this information from a Christian tradition or from the general practice of the Jews at the feast, or whether he, as is most probable, inferred it from our ancient written sources, particularly Matthew and Mark, the most important point is, that a careful investigation of these sources, especially of Matthew, leads to much the same result. Moreover, those sources both more distinctly mark out the several days, and, by representing the 15th of Nisan as a Friday and the day of Jesus' death, and therefore the 8th as a Friday and the day of his entry, they completely overcome the fatal difficulty of the fourth Gospel, which makes Jesus (if, according to the narrative there, he died on Friday the 14th of Nisan) travel on the Sabbath, the 8th of Nisan, contrary to law and custom.² The ancient ecclesiastical tradition, dating from

¹ Grotius, Tholuck, Wieseler, Ewald, Meyer, Ebrard, Lichtenstein, Renan, reckon correctly from the 14th to the 8th of Nisan; Theophylact, Hase, De Wette, Lücke, Wichelhaus, Caspari, Isenberg, Langen, from the 15th (or 14th inclus.) to the 9th; Hilgenfeld, Baur, Baumlein, to the 10th (according to the classical mode of reckoning, and Ex. xii. 3). Comp. Wich. pp. 146 sqq.; Wieseler, *Beitr.* pp. 234, 264; also Meyer. The 8th of Nisan, Jos. *B. J.* 6, 5, 3. A long stay of Jesus in Jerusalem, at least of several weeks, is postulated by Weisse, p. 429; Weizs. pp. 513, 532; Haus-rath, pp. 433 sq. (comp. pp. 385 sqq.); Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 371; Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 288; Scholten, p. 181; Sevin, pp. 7 sqq.; comp. above, III. p. 136, n. 1, V. pp. 10, 132. As if this assumption was not already refuted by Matt. xvii. 24, as well as—not to mention John xii. 1—by the impossibility of distributing the conflicts, which the Synoptics describe, over a number of weeks.

² This very difficulty—which is constituted by Ex. xvi. 29, xxxi. 14 sqq., xxxv. 2; Num. xv. 32 sqq., and which was felt by Theophyl., Joh. Gerhard, Lightfoot, and Bengel, but could not be removed because of the ecclesiastical tradition of Palm Sunday—induced many of the above mentioned to reckon John xii. 1 from the 15th instead of from the 14th of Nisan. For whilst the latter reckoning in John, to whom the 14th is a Friday instead of a Thursday, fatally makes the 8th a Saturday, the former reckoning leads back to the 9th as a Sunday, *i.e.* the first week-day when travelling was permitted. The Synoptics, on the other hand, give to the reckoning from the 14th no difficulty, because to them that date is a Thursday, and the 8th a Friday. By the classical mode of reckoning, the difficulty of the Saturday, upon which those upholders of John who reckon from the 14th strike (thus Ewald, Meyer, Renan), is avoided by supposing that Jesus went only a short distance on the Sabbath (Ewald, p. 511), that perhaps towards night, after the end of the Sabbath, he went to Bethany (Meyer, *Joh.* p. 387). Wieseler is driven into straits even by the Synoptical reckoning. If Jesus went to Bethany on Friday, then he travelled (according to John) to Jerusalem on the Sabbath. Now, Wieseler concludes (*Syn.* p. 392; *Beitr.* p. 264), against the clear

the fourth century, fixing the entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, must then be given up with John.¹

The ancient sources, particularly Matthew, describe for us the several days in the week at Jerusalem, back to the day of entry, and allow us at once, in consequence of our discovery that the 15th of Nisan corresponded to the 15th of April, to substitute for the days of Nisan the corresponding days of April. Before the 14th of April, the day of the supper, Matthew and to some extent Mark point out the evening of Tuesday, the 12th of April, as the moment when Jesus for the last time foretold to his disciples that his death would occur at the Easter which would come in two days.² Matthew gives us the right to place the resolve of the Sanhedrists, narrated immediately after, and the meal at Bethany upon the 12th or 13th, preferably upon the latter date, and the preceding great discourse against the Pharisees and the great discourse about the future, upon the 12th.³

text of John, that Jesus rested in Bethany on the Sabbath and travelled to Jerusalem on the following day (John xii. 12!). Similarly Neander, pp. 475, 479; Wichelh. p. 148, with the excellent remark: even if Jesus arrived at Bethany on Friday, John could say *ἐπαύριον* of the entry into Jerusalem on Sunday, since the Sabbath-day of rest was not to be reckoned. The difficulty which might be found in our view, through our placing—certainly not a journey, but—a passing from Bethany to Jerusalem on the Sabbath, is answered above, V. p. 133.

¹ As early as Epiph., Chrys., *Herzog*, XVIII. p. 223; ingeniously preserved even by Wies. and Wichelh. (previous note).

² Matt. xxvi. 1 sq.; Mark xiv. 1. In Matthew it is distinctly evening, since it is the close of a day the events of which go back to xxiii. 1.

³ It is usual to throw all the sayings of Jesus, from Matt. xxi. 18 to xxv. 46 (comp. the parallel passages) into the so-called third day, the "deedful Tuesday" (Wies.), which in itself is not only a most colossal and really unhistorical accumulation, but—and this is a still weightier objection—rests upon a complete inattention to the intermediate stages which appear at least in Matthew, if not also in Mark and Luke. Not only Wichelh. pp. 168 sqq., but also Wieseler, *Chron. Synopsis*, pp. 392 sqq., start from the unhistorical point of view that makes all these sayings fall upon Tuesday the 12th of Nisan, except that Mark's weak attempt at dividing the temple visit rescues something for Sunday and Monday. According to Wies. and Wich., (1) 8th of Nisan, arrival at Bethany; (2) Sabbath, 9th, in Bethany; (3) Sunday, 10th, entry into Jerusalem; (4) Monday, 11th, purification of the temple; (5) Tuesday, 12th, controversial speeches.—According to the indications in Matthew, Tuesday the 12th separates itself on the evidence of xxvi. 1 sq. (Tuesday evening) from xxiii. 1—xxv. 46. The point of commencement is clearly shown by the formal and factual closing formula (conclusion of a day), xxii. 46. No reasonable man can, after this formula, and in the face of the

Upon Monday the 11th clearly falls the consultation of the Pharisees as to a fresh attack, the result of which is the question put to Jesus about the great commandment and Jesus's counter-question about the Messiah.¹ On Sunday the 10th falls the first deliberation of the Pharisees, when they decide to substitute for ineffectual violence the crafty question as to the legality of the Roman *census*; and on the same day, as is expressly stated, follows the attack of the Sadducees.² On Saturday the 9th, Jesus was required to explain his conduct in purifying the temple, and it was not the Sabbath, but respect for the disposition exhibited by the people, that prevented the hierarchs from using violence against the victorious speaker of parables.³ On the previous day, therefore on Friday the 8th of April, Jesus entered the Holy City and purified the temple.⁴ Previous to this entry—as to the date of which the unanimity of the sources and Josephus, and the total unobjectionableness of a journey on the Friday, leave little to be desired—the accounts are almost entirely without any indications of chronology. Yet since they show that Jesus hastened towards Jerusalem, that he made no long halt anywhere, that he took a straight course through the Jordan valley, that after his tedious journey through the desert

striking transition from the mildness of the last conversation with the Pharisees to the angry tone of the address to the people, xxiii. 1, think that the *rôle* of xxiii. 1 points to the same day as that on which the previous conversation was held. Since, further, there is no room for an indefinite number of days, therefore xxii. falls on the Monday, xxiii. on the Tuesday.

¹ Matt. xxii. 34—46. The closing point is, by xxii. 46, more certainly marked than the commencement, and *if necessary* we might go back as far as xxii. 15. But as it is not probable that there were four collisions in one day, as xxii. 34 clearly refers to a fresh consultation of the opponents (this is its meaning when read with verse 41) after the news of the overthrow of the Sadducees, and as, finally, to go back to xxii. 15 would make Jesus's journey to Jerusalem fall on a Sabbath, the division given above is to be adopted.

² Matt. xxii. 15—33. Commencement clearly marked by the closing formula, Matt. xxi. 45 sq. (xxii. 1—14 by the editor), and by the change of front of the campaign, xxii. 15. Closing point of the section is plainly xxii. 33 sq., the conflict with the Sadducees, xxii. 23, being expressly reckoned among the events of the same day.

³ The commencement of this day is expressly and distinctly fixed, xxi. 18; the close, xxi. 46.

⁴ Matt. xxi. 1—17.

he rested, doubtless passed the night, in Jericho, we may most probably assume that his journey from Galilee occupied about four days, that he rested in Jericho on Thursday the 7th, and that he began at Capernaum on Monday the 4th, or more probably on the day after the Sabbath, Sunday the 3rd of April, the journey which twelve days after brought him to his death on the 15th.¹

¹ On the beginning of the journey, see V. p. 1; Jericho, *ib.* p. 21. Hase's dilatory remark, p. 214: it may easily have happened that tradition, concerning itself but little(?) with questions of time, conceived the journey from Jericho simply as a whole; therefore John could give what intermediate stations he pleased, notably at Bethany.

DIVISION III.—BURIAL AND RESURRECTION.

A.—THE LORD'S SEPULCHRE.

EVEN among the Greeks and Romans there was, as a rule, no burial for the crucified. "I know," cries the slave in Plautus, "a cross will be my grave; there rest my ancestors!" Theodorus, the philosopher of Cyrene, was indifferent whether he rotted in the ground or in the air.¹ The corpses were the prey of ravens, vultures, dogs, wolves, or even snakes.² Distracted relatives and friends saw the birds of prey attack the very faces of those whom they loved; and piety often took pains to scare away the birds by day and the beasts by night, or to outwit the guards that watched the dead.³ In the later persecutions of the Christians, the guards remained four or six days by the dead, in order to secure them to the wild beasts and to cut off all possibility of burial and resurrection; and in Lyons the Christians were not once able by offers of much gold to obtain the privilege of showing compassion upon the victims of the pagan popular fury.⁴ Sometimes, however, particularly on festival days, e.g. the birthdays of the emperors, the corpse was given up to the friends of the deceased, either for money or without money, although even

¹ Plautus, *Miles Glor.* 2, 4, 19: scio crucem futurum mihi sepulcrum, ibi mei sunt majores siti. Plut. *Cleom.* 39. Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 43: Theodori quidem nihil interest, humine an sublime putrescat! Comp. the Philistines, 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 2 Sam. xxi. 12.

² Horace, *Ep.* 1, 16, 48 (comp. *Epod.* 5, 99, lupi): non pascas in cruce corvos. Suet. *Oct.* 13: volucrum potestas. Pliny, 36, 24, 3: feris volucribusque laceranda. Juvenal, 14, 77: vultur jumento et canibus crucibusque relictis. Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 43 (*Ferr.* 2, 45): sublime putrescere; volucris et feris. Catull. 108, 1 sqq.: vultures, ravens, dogs, wolves. Similarly Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 9. Plut. *Cleom.* 39: snakes, birds on the face. Artem. *Oneir.* 2, 53: πολλοὺς τρέφει. Σάρκας ἀπολλύουσιν οἱ στρουθόεντες. Comp. Iliad, 24, 41 sq., and Genesis xl. 19.

³ Petron. *Sat.* 111 sq. Plut. *Cleom.* 39. Comp. 2 Sam. xxi. 10, 12; Jer. vii. 33.

⁴ Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 9, 11; *H. E.* 4, 15; 5, 1.

Augustus could be cruel enough to turn a deaf ear to the entreaties of the condemned for sepulture.¹

The Jewish custom was different, as the history of the martyr Stephen shows. The law ordained that the bodies of the hanged should be taken down at sunset, that the land might not be defiled; and, as Josephus shows, to this police regulation humanity added that the privilege of sepulture should not be denied even to the crucified or the foe killed in battle, that punishment should not extend beyond death, should not be distorted into what was unnatural and godless.² Even suicides were thrown out only until sunset, and were afterwards buried.³ This rule was seldom departed from, and the departures from it occurred chiefly in the ancient and ruder times, when the prophets menaced the godless kings with the teeth of wild beasts, and the Gibeonites allowed the sons and grandsons of Saul to hang until David ultimately buried them. It was departed from again later, in the cruel administration of the Zealots at the siege of Jerusalem, when the unfortunates on their way to death prayed for burial, when the murdered Zacharias was ignominiously hurled down from the temple court into the Kedron valley, when the bodies of the venerable high-priests Annas and Jesus were left lying unburied, the slain rotted in heaps in the city, and a similar fate was threatened as a punishment to those who buried or mourned over the dead.⁴ The Rabbis also expressly laid

¹ More fully below. Feast-days, Philo, *Flacc.* : τοῖς συγγενέσι. Suet. *Oct.* 13.

² Deut. xxi. 23 : Joshua viii. 29. Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 24 (comp. 6) : θαπτίσθω νεκρός. Θαπτίσθωσαν δὲ κ. οἱ πολέμιοι καὶ νεκρὸς μηδὲ εἰς γῆς ἄμμορος κείσθω, περαιτέρω τοῦ δίκαιου τιμωρίαν τινύων. Similarly *B.J.* 4, 5, 2 : πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου. Παρὰ φῶσιν, ἀσβεῖς, 4, 5, 2 ; 4, 6, 3. Hence *B.J.* 4, 6, 3 : ἐλπὶς ταφῆς. *Sanh.* c. 6 : quic. mortuum pernoctare facit insepultum, violat præceptum prohibitivum. Lightfoot, p. 389. According to a gloss on *Gem. Sanh.* c. 6, h. 4, executions were prope ad occasum solis, ita ut cito eum sepeliant. In the case of earlier executions, the legal burial would easily be forgotten. Lightfoot, pp. 385 sq. Comp. also Acts viii. 2, v. 6, 10.

³ Jos. *B.J.* 3, 8, 5.

⁴ Menaces, 1 Kings xiv. 11, xvi. 4, xxi. 24 ; Jer. vii. 33 ; Book of Enoch, 98. Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi. 9, 12. Philistines, see above. Comp. 2 Kings ix. 35. Entreaties of those about to be executed, Jos. *B.J.* 4, 6, 1 : περὶ ταφῆς ἰκέτευσ. Zealots, *ib.*

down the principle, not only that no dead body should be allowed to remain in Jerusalem until night, but also that to allow a dead body to remain a night without burial was a breach of the law.¹ Since the Romans in Judæa accommodated themselves to the customs of the country, and were prepared to admit exceptions, it is to be supposed that Jesus in prospect of a speedy death reckoned upon receiving burial, and that Pilate would not hesitate to give up the corpse of Jesus to his friends.²

According to the fourth Gospel, all the crucified were taken down, at the request of the Jews to Pilate, on account of the approaching Sabbath feast-day of the 15th of Nisan. This report is somewhat suspicious, because it not only differently explains the taking down of Jesus's corpse from the cross, but also stands in the closest connection with the singular narrative of a lance-thrust inflicted upon one already dead, and of the remarkable flow of blood and water from the wound in the side.³ The request of the Jews, according to John, was to the effect that on account of the approaching Sabbath the legs of the still living criminals should be broken and the corpses then taken down.⁴ It was evidently assumed that all were still alive, including Jesus, whose death just before had not yet been made known to the petitioners. Pilate consented, and the first and then the

4, 5, 2 (4, 5, 3; 4, 3, 4; 4, 6, 3): τοσούτον ἀσεβείας, ὥστε καὶ ἀτάφους ῥίψαι, καίτοι τοσ. Ἰουδαίων περὶ τ. ταφᾶς πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων, ὥστε κ. τοὺς ἐκ καταδίκης ἀνασταυρουμένους πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν τε καὶ θάπτειν. Zacharias, *B.J.* 4, 5, 4; Annas, *ib.* 4, 5, 2. Rev. xi. 8 is hereby explained.

¹ Lightfoot, pp. 141, 389.

² Matt. xxvi. 12, xxvii. 58. Roman custom, Quint. *Decl.* 6, 9: sepeliri carnifex non vetat. *Dig. L. I. D. de cadav. punit.* (Geib, pp. 385, 672): corpora eorum, qui capite damnantur, cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt; et id se observasse (not always, see above, p. 251) etiam div. Augustus libro X. de vita s. scribit. On the other hand, however, Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 61; Tac. *Ann.* 6, 19, 29) forbade it. Tac. 6, 29: sepultura prohibebantur. Verres, on his part, Cic. *Verr.* 5, 45: hoc (ferre) si luctuosum est parenti, redimat pretio sepeliendi potestatem. Many examples of selling and presenting, Plut. *Galb.* 28.

³ John xix. 31—37. Comp. above, p. 176.

⁴ Origen on Matt. 140, erroneously says: miserti ergo sunt Judæi post crudelem condemnationem eorum. Yet he corrects himself: aut forte non propter misericordiam hoc fecerunt Judæi, sed principaliter propter sabbatum.

second of the robbers were put to death by blows on the legs. The soldiers, coming to Jesus, found him dead already, and they therefore refrained from the final act of torture; but one of them, in order to leave no doubt of death, pierced him in the side with his lance. Thus the author establishes the three-fold miracle, that blood and water mysteriously flowed from the wound, that the words of Moses concerning the Passover lamb, "No bone of it shall be broken," were true of Jesus, and finally, that in him Zechariah's prediction, "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced!" was fulfilled.¹

This narration is, both as a whole and in detail, very plainly unhistorical, as we have already partly shown. It is true that some things speak for it, and above all the law which did not permit the putrefying corpses to remain hanging through the night or into the Sabbath, after twelve hours of exposure to the air and to public gaze, and the letter of which might here have been respected by the Romans;² also the actual Roman custom, which was not abrogated until Constantine suppressed it with crucifixion itself, viz., the crushing of the legs from the hip to the foot with hammers and clubs, chiefly as an independent capital punishment for slaves, here and there, particularly in more ancient times, as a conclusion of the capital punishment, as a *coup de grace*, which again might be performed in another manner by a sword-cut or a lance-thrust.³ Moreover, it must

¹ John xix. 34—37, comp. Ex. xii. 46; Zech. xii. 10, comp. Rev. i. 7. The Jewish theology refers this passage in Zechariah to Ben Joseph, comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 552.

² See above, p. 251, n. 2; especially Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 6 (also 24): ὁ δὲ βλασφημήσας θεὸν καταλευσθείς κρεμάσθω δι' ἡμέρας κ. ἀτίμως κ. ἀφανῶς θαπτίσθω.

³ The *crurifragium* (σκελοκοπία; καταγνύναι σκελη, John, comp. Eus. 8, 12; καταγνύμενοι τ. σκ.; συντριψαντες, Polyb., see below), which is to be distinguished from *incidere crura*, Vulg. *Cass.* 4; also from *τυμπανισμός*, 2 Macc. vi. 28, Heb. xi. 35, was originally an independent primitive cruel capital punishment, especially for slaves and freedmen. Aur. Vict. *Ces.* 41: Constantinus eo pius, ut etiam vetus veterimumque supplicium patibulorum et cruribus suffringendis primus removerit. In the last persecutions of the Christians, Eus. 8, 12 (in Cappadocia). Plaut. *Asin.* 2, 4, 68 (comp. *Poen.* 4, 2, 64): crura hercle defringentur. Cic. *Rosc. A.* 20: crura quidem vobis nemo suffringet. Sen. *Ir.* 3, 32: quid properamus verberare statim, crura protinus frangere? 3, 18: perfringi crura, erui oculos, amputari manus (Sylla) jussit.

be admitted, against modern doubts, that this most cruel *finale* might follow even the cruel punishment of the cross, and that when this so-called *crurifragium* was effectively carried out, there was no fear of the removal or burial of persons who were only half dead.¹ Nevertheless, these grounds are not sufficient. Even the legal necessity remains questionable. Since the crucified were still alive, and according to all probability would have lived through thirty-six hours' suffering, and must therefore have survived the Sabbath, and even in case they died on the Sabbath would not have putrefied and stunk, there was no question of immediate conflict with the law, unless it could be said that the hanging of living persons on the cross desecrated the Sabbath. But if it did not desecrate the current feast-day, would the Jews have been so scrupulous as to the following Sabbath? And if crucifixion on the feast-day was, by fanatics, held to be a service done to God, would that acceptable service not be appropriate to the Sabbath also?² But if, after examining all the

Suet. *Oct.* 67: Thallo (a freedman) crura effregit. Also Suet. *Tib.* 44. Ammian. 14, 9: Apollinares ambo fractis cruribus occiduntur. Comp. Just. 21, 4; Eus. 5, 21. Precursor of crucifixion, so that the dead was crucified, Just. 21, 4. At the same time this punishment was here and there inflicted, particularly in more remote times, plainly as a kind of *coup de grace* after other tortures, Cic. *Philipp.* 13, 12: quod proverbii loco dici solet: perire eum non posse, nisi ei crura fracta essent. Fracta sunt et vivit. Lact. *Inst.* 4, 26: necess. non putaverunt, ossa ejus suffringere, sicut mos eorum ferebat. Tert. *Ap.* 21: prævento carnificis officio. Somewhat different is the percussio with sword or lance (comp. above, p. 150, n. 1). Quint. *Decl.* 6, 9: cruces succiduntur, percussos sepeliri carnifex non vetat. It has been questioned (Hug) whether the crurifr. was really fatal, whether the tortured might not after all be buried alive; but there can be no doubt that the crurifr., when vigorously inflicted, would and was meant to cause death; at any rate those that remained alive (Cic. *l.c.*) would be the exceptions, as in the case of the man thrown away half dead, of which Polyb. *Hist.* 1, 80, 13, says: κολοβώσαντες κ. συντριψάντες τ. σκέλη ἔτι ζῶντας ἔρριψαν εἰς τινὰ ταφρον.

¹ Hug had thought of that, *Zeitschr. &c.*, 5, 64: the maltreated were left to their fate. See previous note. Similarly Neander, p. 581. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 553. Langen, p. 355, also against Strauss.

² Although we may appeal, against the scrupulosity as to the Sabbath, to all the above-mentioned considerations, as well as to the Sabbath licence with respect to the dead (Lightfoot, p. 565), and to the Gentile, not Jewish, action, yet the anxiety about the Sabbath, the demonstrability of the confector, and the statements and motives given above, p. 251, n. 2, p. 253, n. 2, make it probable that in Judæa the crucified were as a rule put to death in the evening and then buried.

evidences, and on the ground of the servilely and erroneously expounded command of Deut. xxi. 23, it should be admitted that the putting to death of those who were still alive on the cross and the burying of them on the evening of the same day, and particularly of the day before the Sabbath, was customary among the Jews, it must at least be held that the final shattering of the crucified neither was the prevailing rule among the Romans, who very strongly objected to the punishment of the cross itself and only in proverbs found it impossible to break down the most inflexible natures without the most violent blows, nor could it, in the face of the more humane spirit of Judaism, be the result of a request from the Jews. Moreover, there comes in here with overwhelming force the fact, that among the many crucifixions which are mentioned as occurring in Roman Judæa, the cross is always mentioned as the final torture, while the cruel addition of breaking the bones is not once named.¹

But still more damaging counter-evidence can be adduced against whatever may be urged in justification of John's account. In the first place, the earlier sources not only know nothing of these leg-breakings and lance-thrusts, but they leave no room for them. For if, according to the earlier Gospels, an adherent

¹ John xix. 31 shows first a request of the Jews, then a Roman custom. The request for the performance of a cruel act, even though it should hasten death, is unnatural in itself, and especially un-Jewish (comp. above, p. 74, n. 3; also Jos. *Vita*, 75; *Bab. Sanh.* f. 42, 2; Lightfoot, p. 386). But a prevailing Roman custom did not exist at all, as—despite Origen on Matt. 140 (sec. consuet. Rom.) and Lact. *Inst.* 4, 36 (see p. 253, note 3)—Origen himself most strikingly proves by mentioning the two days' life of the crucified (comp. Eus. 8, 8). He is acquainted with simply the percussio (sub alas corporis) in the beginning of the execution as consuetudo Romanorum (falsely expounded by Bunsen, p. 460), and violently explains from it the statement of John (manifestat etiam Joannes hoc modo scribens). Disapproval of the crurifr. in Cicero, Seneca, Aur. Victor, see above, p. 253, n. 3. In the Roman crucifixions in Palestine, the cross is final; other tortures, although expressly mentioned, precede it. Jos. *B.J.* 2, 14, 9; 5, 11, 1, &c. Only confectio in general (by the confector, Suet. *Oct.* 43; Eus. 4, 15) is well attested, see above, p. 168; comp. Eus. 4, 15; 8, 8. *Sanh.* f. 46, 2; *Gem. Sanh.* 6, 4, in Lightfoot, p. 386. Wetst. p. 950. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 553 (quoting Lips. *De Cruce*, 2, 14), and Renan, 15th ed. p. 443, say that there exists no other example of crurifr. at or after crucifixion (yet see above, p. 253, n. 3); on the other hand, Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 299, thinks that Jesus could not have been buried but for the crurifr.

of Jesus carried the first news of his death to Pilate and received permission to take away, nay to take down, the corpse of Jesus, Pilate could not, either before or after, have commanded the watch to take Jesus down from the cross together with the others after having broken their legs.¹ In fact, John plainly contradicts himself; for having first given his new account of the command to the guard to take down the men that had been crucified, he afterwards, inadvertently following the earlier account, tells us of the successful request of Jesus's friend for permission to take down the body. According to the former account, the soldiers must have taken down Jesus; according to the latter, Jesus's friend and his assistants must have done it.² But here objections suggest themselves in crowds. Jesus was undoubtedly treated as the most eminent of the three criminals, and was crucified in the middle: would the execution of the command to take down the bodies begin with the less eminent of the criminals, first right and then left, and be afterwards completed in the middle? If Jesus died with a loud cry—as we are everywhere told—and if the captain and the watch were astonished at the cry and at the end of the just man, would the soldiers have been ignorant of his death until they went up to his cross? If the soldiers, who, according to the narrative, did their work in a business-like and passionless way, were clearly cognizant of the dying of Jesus, would they then have undertaken the superlative and ridiculous trouble of making him still more dead by the aid of a fresh instrument introduced on purpose?

Order can be brought into this confusion only by the recognition of the artificial construction of the whole narrative. The three miracles—so significantly narrated, yet in truth so far-fetched and trivial—are not additions to, but the creative conceptions of, this narrative. Since Jesus was to be the Passover lamb, of which no bone was to be broken—since he was to be

¹ Matt. xxvii. 57 sq. Taking down, Luke xxiii. 50—53; Mark xv. 46, comp. 36. First intelligence, Mark xv. 42—45.

² John xix. 31, comp. 38. Similarly Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 395. Miserable expedients in De Wette, *Joh.*, and Steinm. p. 228.

the God-like one that was to be pierced—since he was to show by blood and water the gift of the Spirit springing from his death—the Evangelist, with the aid of his inaccurate acquaintance with Roman means of execution, composed the narrative that falls to pieces in our hands.¹ He would doubtless have given more probability to his account if he had been content with the *coup de grace* of the lance-thrust for the three who were crucified, had mentioned Jesus first, and had distinguished him by the flowing out of blood and water; but then not only would the passage from Zechariah have lost its unique reference to him, but, the most important of all, the unbroken Passover lamb would have fallen away altogether. Thus he had no alternative: he must adopt the *crurifragium*, and then—necessarily last—the lance-thrust reserved for Jesus alone, and somewhat better supported by the Roman practice.²

Thus, whilst his companions in suffering still languished on the cross, Jesus after a few hours found through God the repose of death, and through men the repose of the grave. A fresh sign that love did not die with him, even though he ended as he did, that love survived, and that he, the dead, continued to live in this love, is afforded by the daring approach of a silent friend to Pilate. Whilst the disciples left their Lord to himself and his foes, whilst the women did not venture to ask of the inexorable man the right of performing the last service of love, which belonged to them, an old disciple of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathæa, appeared upon the place of execution before six o'clock in the evening, when it was too late to help, but when a noble work

¹ According to Aberle (comp. *Hilg. Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 92), John wished, by this account of the crurifr., to remove any Jewish-Christian doubts as to the reality of the death of Jesus.

² Earlier critics, down to Hug, speak of a Roman *coup de grace*, which completed the effect of the crurifr.; but there is nowhere any proof of this, as Meyer admits. The percussio sub alas in Origen on Matt. 140 (see above, p. 150, n. 1, p. 139, n. 3) is something quite different. The proverbial νεκροὺς ἐπισφάττειν, Philo, *De creat. princ.* II. p. 396 (Wetst. p. 957), has also nothing to do with it. Neander brings forward an instance out of the martyrology, *Act. S. Jun.* III. p. 571. I mention the sword of the confector, in the case of Polycarp, Eus. 4, 15, and the percussio, Quint. *Decl.* 6, 9, above, p. 254, note; confectio, above, p. 255, note.

still remained to be done.¹ Nothing has been preserved to us but the name of this man, his home, and the fact that he was rich. The various statements of later Gospels that he was a counsellor, and as such had not consented to the decisions of the Sanhedrim, are the fruit of subsequent reflection; and the descriptive comment of the fourth Gospel, that Joseph, like Nicodemus, had been a friend of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, is contradicted by the heroic bearing of the man, who appeared on the scene when all others had left it.² It is much to be regretted that the very three words in which his name is preserved are full of obscurity. "There came Joseph of Arimathæa." Did he come from Arimathæa, from the Ramah of Benjamin, two leagues distant from Jerusalem on the north? Had he perhaps been sought out by the disciples who had fled along the most direct road for Galilee? Had he been told by them of the catastrophe, and had he, in his despair heedless of the feast-day, hastened to the spot where he might perhaps be in time to save a dear life, might perhaps beg Jesus down from

¹ The evening, Matt. xxvii. 57, is here of course (also Friedl. p. 160) the early evening (between 3 and 6 p.m.). Jesus was then already dead, and Joseph could not go to Pilate later; besides, the Jews buried *πρὸ ὀνότος ἡλίου* (Jos. B.J. 4, 5, 2). *Ad occasum solis*, see above, p. 251, n. 2. The name of the place is in the Codd. almost always Arimathæa. Arimathia (itac.) chiefly in Cod. D, It., Vulg. Eus. (Jerome), *Onom.* pp. 61, 317, both interchangeably. Origen on Matt. vers. Ruf. 142: A—ia. The discipleship is expressed in Matt. xxvii. 57; instead of *ἐμαθήτευσε* (A B L), read *ἐμαθητεύθη*, Sin. C D, comp. Matt. xiii. 52, xxviii. 19. Luke xxiii. 51 and Mark xv. 43 have the same meaning (*προσδεχ. βασιλ.*). John xix. 38 repeats the discipleship out of Matthew, but converts it into a concealed one, to which he is led by the description of Nicodemus, who goes by the side of Joseph, and particularly by the mysterious description of the Synoptics, who here showed a disciple that had not been observed to accompany Jesus.

² Luke, Mark, John, *i.e.* Mark is the simplest: *εὐσχήμων βουλευτής*. Luke says, periphrastically, *ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθὸς κ. δίκαιος*, without participation in the counsels and action of the hierarchy. John is silent about both characteristics, but has (see below) transferred them to Nicodemus. It is very conceivable that tradition in the course of time should transform the man of much property, the disciple and non-disciple, into a dissident Sanhedrist. Matthew is at any rate the more natural. On the contrary, Weiss, *Markus*, p. 506. Also Ewald, pp. 490, 586, and even Volk., p. 603, retain the counsellor. Steinmeyer, p. 245, makes him repent, with Nicodemus, for being silent in the Sanhedrim. Scholten, p. 191, takes him to have been counsellor only in Arimathæa. Noack, IV. p. 136: the Gospels infer it from the name (*arûm, i. e. sapiens*)!

the cross by words and deeds?¹ Such a procedure would have been exquisitely touching; but it is more probable that he dwelt, not at his native place, but in Jerusalem; that his native place was not the Ramah close at hand, but the much more remote Haramataim, the city of Samuel in the tribe of Ephraim; and that he now first showed himself, not in consequence of late—too late—news of the terrible occurrence, but rather in consequence of the paralyzing effect of that occurrence.² When he found the

¹ This hypothesis so readily suggests itself, that I am surprised not to have seen it mentioned. Among the Gospels, Matthew xxvii. 57 favours the (against Meyer) unmistakable interpretation: he came from Arimathæa. The explanation of Arimathæa as Ramah (height) in the tribe of Benjamin (at present the village, er Ram), is favoured by the nearness of this place to Jerusalem (forty stadia, *Jos. Ant.* 8, 12, 3, or six Roman miles, Eus. (Jerome) *Onom.* 308 sq., north of Jerus.); moreover, Oriental versions point to Ramah, and many modern critics (*e.g.* Friedlieb, Meyer) are the more inclined to adopt it because they identify this Ramah with the Ramah or Ramataim of Samuel. Saving of the crucified, *e.g.* by Josephus in the year 70 (see below).

² Most probably the place of residence was Jerusalem, and Arimathæa only the place of birth, a supposition favoured by Luke, Mark, and John, and not forbidden even by Matthew (since ἀπὸ Α. can be connected merely with ἀνθρ. instead of with ἡλθ); and finally it is required, or at least supported, by the fact that Joseph's burial-ground was at Jerusalem (verse 60). Further, Joseph's town can scarcely have been the Ramah of Benjamin, but the Ramah of Ephraim, or Ha-Ramathaim (1 Sam. i. 1) of Samuel. The Benjaminite town is generally called simply Ramah, and is thus called in Matt. ii. 18, once with the article Haramah, Is. x. 29, or in Josephus once Ramathon, *Ant.* 8, 12, 3; on the contrary, the Ephraimite place, Haramathaim, 1 Sam. i. 1 (LXX. Armathaim); Ramathem, 1 Macc. xi. 34; Armathem, Eus. (Jerome) *Onom.* 60 sq.; Ramatha, *Jos. Ant.* 5, 10, 2; 6, 4, 1, &c. Arimathæa can be better derived from this word. These two Ramahs are by no means identical, as is often assumed (even by Hilg. *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 71), particularly because of the fact that the Ramah of Benjamin was also on Mount Ephraim. It has been overlooked that Josephus distinguishes between the two, and that whilst the Ramah near Jerusalem is reckoned to the tribe of Benjamin, the Ramah of Samuel is expressly said to belong to another φυλή, *Ant.* 6, 4, 1. No other of the many Ramahs (heights) of the country is to be thought of, except these two, not even the Galilean one in the tribe of Naphtali, Josh. xix. 26, as later this does not appear at all, and everything points to the south. Noack, I. p. 250, IV. p. 136, speaks of the Gennesar castle Areimeh. But the strangest supposition is the identification of our Arimathæa with Ramleh near Lydda (Diospolis), in the tribe of Dan, N.W. from Jerusalem; yet the contemporaries of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onom.* 317) have fallen upon this by giving an altogether erroneous interpretation of the names Arumah and Remphis. On the contrary, recently Raumer, Gross, Hausrath, Ewald, Renan, Bleek, have correctly expressed themselves in favour of the Ramah of Ephraim, and Van de Velde has pointed out a village, Bet Rima, six or seven leagues N.W. of Jerusalem, north of Abud, in the latitude of Joppa. In ancient times it was the metropolis of the district (1 Macc. xi. 34); under the Asmonæan Jonathan

Master whom he revered already dead, the painful spectacle drove him, not to inactive mourning or to prudent silence, but to a bold deed of love and compassion. This was the only act by which a service could now be rendered in a genuinely Jewish manner to the departed Master.¹ He hastened back to the city, it may be after a brief consultation with the women, went straight into the palace of Pilate, and begged—if not as one who had the rights of a relative, yet with the same plea as was urged by the disciples of John in the case of their teacher, and by the Hellenists in the case of Stephen, as friend and acquaintance—for the body of Jesus for burial.

As Mark justly adds, it was a bold act thus to approach the procurator whose mood could not be reckoned upon, who, after momentarily defending “the perverter of the people,” had nevertheless sacrificed him. It was a still bolder act to do this in the face of the Jews, who might transfer their rage from the Crucified to his disciple, and who in the Acts of Pilate are said to have really done so.² Hence that work describes the very serious nature of the resolution, the hesitation of Pilate, the prostration, entreaties and tears of Joseph, whilst Venturini extols the gracious intercession of Procla.³ We have preserved to us, from the persecutions of the Christians, the significant incident that a servant of Porphyry, who begged of the governor Firmilian the burial of his master the presbyter Pamphilus, was himself arrested and executed.⁴ But in truth Pilate received Joseph favourably—according to Mark, not without surprise at the speedy

it was attached to Judæa, wherefore Luke is correct when he calls Arimathæa a Jewish city (xxiii. 51), a title which, however, would also befit the Ramah of Benjamin (Jos. *Ant.* 8, 12, 3: *πόλις τῶν οὐκ ἀφανῶν*).

¹ Comp. the service performed by Tobit [Eng. Vers. Tobit, i. 19, ii. 8, comp. vi. 14]. Matt. viii. 21. Also Jos. *B.J.* 4, 6, 3: *ἐλπὶς ταφῆς*, and 4, 6, 1: *περὶ ταφῆς ἰκέτευε*.

² Despite quotations in n. 2, p. 251, n. 2, p. 252. Imprisonment of Joseph by the Jews, *Acta Pil.* 12. According to Steinmeyer, p. 243, the daring consisted not in making the petition, but in entering the unclean palace! According to Weiss, *Markus*, p. 505, it consisted in the prematurity of the petition.

³ In *Acta Pil.* A. c. 11, simple narrative as in the Gospels. On the contrary, *Acta Pil.* B.

⁴ Eus. *Mart. P.* 11.

death of Jesus—and immediately granted him his wish, since he—Pilate—felt personally no hatred, no aversion, to Jesus, perhaps also because a gift of money, such as it was quite customary—according to Philo, the invariable rule—for Pilate to receive, a few thousand of the rich petitioner's *drachmæ*, procured the compliance of the governor, the willingness to “make a present” of the corpse of which Mark makes special mention.¹ Either a written authority received by Joseph, or a verbal command to the captain by a subordinate, secured the handing over of the body.

With the help of servants, perhaps also of soldiers, the blood-stained cross was now overthrown or laid down, the cords were untied, the nails extracted or stripped out.² The corpse was carried to its burial-place, perhaps in a wooden coffin, to the four “horns” of which it was made fast.³ According to Matthew, Joseph possessed, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, not exactly in the neighbourhood of the place of execution, a new and as yet unused rock-sepulchre, which he had excavated for himself.⁴ Such rock or cave sepulchres were very common, and at the present day Jerusalem is surrounded by them. They were entered either on the level ground, or by steps leading down to the grave chambers, which were often arranged in series, and in the side walls of which the *kukin*, small niches, six or seven feet long, for the dead, were hewn out or built.⁵

¹ Philo, *Leg.* p. 1033 : τὰς δωροδοκίας, first characteristic mentioned. See above, II. p. 224, note. Comp. Felix, in Acts xxiv. 26. Verres, Cic. 2, 45 ; 5, 45. 2500 drachmæ, Plut. *Galb.* 28 ; comp. also above, p. 252, n. 2, and Wetst. p. 638. Paulus, p. 823, is led by Mark to reject the supposition of a bribe.

² Quint. *Declam.* 6, 9 : cruces succiduntur, percussos sepeliri carnifex non vetat. Hence Barn. 12 (comp. *Acta Pil.*, above, p. 132), στανυρὸς (ξύλον) κλίνεται. Blood, *ib.*, after 4 Esra v. 5. The first account (Mark xv. 46 ; comp. Matt. xxvii. 59) by no means requires us to think of the taking down of the corpse as if the cross was still standing. To take off, detrahere, Tert. *Ap.* 21. Talmud, achet (aph. of nechat, Bux. p. 1331) meal zelibaja. The unnailing, τὸ ἀφηλοῦσθαι, *Trypho*, 108 ; refigere de crucibus, Sen. *V. Beat.* 19.

³ σοφοῦς, Luke vii. 14. Horns, tractate *Parah*, 12, 9 ; Winer, *Leichen*.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 60.

⁵ Comp. Winer, *Grab, begraben*. Lightfoot, p. 238. Friedl. p. 173. Ewald, *V.* p. 586, VI. p. 83. Renan, 15th ed. p. 447. Excavated sepulchres, Is. xxii. 16. The *kukin* (kuk, kuka), Bux. p. 1619. Lightfoot, p. 678.

To the Israelite, burial was of the highest moment as the means whereby he—like the Egyptian—perpetuated as far as possible his existence upon earth, in the Holy Land, in the Holy City, among his fathers, and also, according to the later theology of the Scribes, prepared for his future resurrection. Hence it is easy to understand why, from very early times, Israelites secured for themselves during their lifetime these asylums of the dead, “the eternal houses,” and made them as durable and as habitable as possible. This was done particularly by the wealthy, by princes like king Herod or the tetrarch Philip, by rich private citizens like Joseph of Ramataim, and indeed by any one who was able to do it. We are told of hereditary sepulchres even in the case of men who had been executed; and Josephus relates that many Jewish fugitives, during the last investment of the Holy City, came back again despite all the accumulated horrors within, because there they could reckon upon at least the last possession of all, a grave.¹ The account in Matthew is therefore quite credible.² Luke and Mark express themselves less definitely about the rock-sepulchre, being silent as to Joseph’s ownership, which however they clearly assume. John speaks of a garden grave at the place of execution, whose owner was at any rate not Joseph, and which it was decided to use only because the approach of the Sabbath made it necessary to do so. But doubtless Matthew’s account is the best, since a strange burial-place could neither be forcibly appropriated or provisionally used (indeed no mention is made of such provisional use), nor—as the Acts of Pilate would have it—be hurriedly purchased. Moreover, the necessity of burial would allow of the removal of the corpse—a lesser evil at the commencement of the Sabbath than permitting the corpse to remain unburied—even to a remote place, if the situation of Joseph’s grave happened

¹ The eternal houses, *botte haolam*, Eccles. xii. 5. The fugitives, *Jos. B. J.* 4, 6, 3. *Sepulera patrum*, *Sanh.* c. 6, h. 5; also among the common people. Comp. also the Hellenists, Acts ii. 5.

² Strauss, II. 4th ed. p. 500, attacks the “new” grave. Scholter, p. 192 (following Mark), attacks even Joseph’s ownership. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lec.* I. p. 291, admits this.

to involve such a labour.¹ The Holy Sepulchre which is now shown as the place of burial meets the requirements of the suggestion in John, being furnished with the above-mentioned niches, and lying only about 110 paces from the alleged Golgotha; it has, however, been sufficiently shown how little this tradition is to be depended upon.² But the Johannine account is fully explained by the fact that it was most convenient to bring Golgotha and the grave close together, a procedure which was made the easier by the brevity of the earlier narratives and by the remembrance of the Sabbatic preparation.

Joseph, his servants, and the few Galilean women that had stood under the cross, made up the small funeral procession which, on account of the preparation for the Sabbath, was not inconvenienced by the few Jews who were met on the way.³ According to John, there was also present the Nicodemus in whose absolutely unattested personality we have already suspected a fictitious duplicate of Joseph, and in whom indeed we may discover a Jewish celebrity, borrowed, like Gamaliel, by later Christendom.⁴ The Acts of Pilate also makes Nicodemus to be

¹ Luke xxiii. 53; Mark xv. 46; John xix. 41. *Acta Pil.* B. c. 11. Provisional grave, Schleierm. p. 471; Ewald, p. 586; Renan, 15th ed. p. 447; Caspari, p. 201; A. Schweizer, *Prot. K.-Z.* 1864; Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 299. Right of burial, above, p. 251, n. 2; below, p. 265, n. 3.

² Arnold, *Das Heilige Grab*, in *Herzog*, V. pp. 296 sqq. Langen, p. 398. Proximity to Golgotha, emphasized by Thiele, p. 69; Krabbe, p. 510; Langen, *l.c.* Noack, I. p. 250: Joseph's garden at Sichem.

³ Matt. xxvii. 61.

⁴ Above, III. p. 274, where the striking transference of the official position of Joseph to Nicodemus, in the fourth Gospel, has been already pointed out. Krenkel, *Hily. Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 438, also saw this identity, but explained it out of a real double name, whilst Baur and Strauss (4th ed. I. pp. 659 sqq.) more correctly explained away the person. It remains here to follow up the traces of Nicodemus among the Jews. In Jos. *Ant.* 14, 3, 2, an ambassador sent by Aristobulus II. to Pompey is named Nicodemus. In *B. J.* 2, 17, 10, appears a Gorion (Guria, Bux. p. 412, young lion), son of Nicomedes (according to all that follows, this name is the same as Nicodemus), as an aristocratic head of the Jews in the beginning of the rebellion (summer of 66), from whom is to be distinguished Gorion, son of Joseph, who appears somewhat later (*A.D.* 68; *B. J.* 4, 3, 9; 4, 6, 1). The name Nicodemus very common among the Greeks, Wetst. p. 850. An Athenian naval commander, Diod. 14, 81. In the Talmud, a Naklimon ben Gorion plays an important part, comp. Bux. p. 1386; Lightfoot, pp. 457, 609; Wetst. p. 850; Renan, 15th ed. p. 228. Indeed, his person is already

present, although—true to his rôle of a timid man—he had previously hesitated to accompany Joseph to Pilate; and besides

completely clothed in myth. His proper name is said to have been Bunni (also in Old Test., comp. Bunni, Binnui, Bani, *i.e.* built, in Jos. Bannus, and the disciple of Jesus in the Talm. identified by Renan with that Bannus, above, I. p. 23), *Taan.* f. 19, 2; 20, 1; and he is said to have been the first of the three richest men at the time of Titus's war, *Gitt.* f. 56, 1 (as fourth, a Ben Nakdimon is however introduced). He was rich enough to furnish every inhabitant of Jerusalem with three measures (seah) of meal, *Pirk. Elies.* 2; nay, so rich was he that, like the two others, he could provision Jerusalem for ten years, *Taan.* l. c., *Kohel. R.* 7, 13. His daughter's bed was strewn with 12,000 denarii, *R. Natan*, 7; and the wise men daily supplied her with 400 gold pieces for spices, *Bab. Chetub.* 66, 2. Her marriage contract spoke of a million golden denarii, Lightfoot, p. 457. He was not only a magnus urbis, but also a disciple of the wise, *Beresh. Rabb.* 42, 1, and counsellor, *Pirk. Elies.* 2; *Echab Rabb.* f. 64, 1. He was, moreover, so beneficent, that when there was a lack of water at a feast, he would pay twelve talents for the use of twelve wells for the people, *Taan.* l. c. Th's beneficence made him a favourite of God, who, in answer to his prayer in the sanctuary, sent copious rain, so that on the appointed day he might give back the wells full of water, and when the lenders of the wells derisively told him the sun had already sunk, God renewed the sunshine at his entreaty, *Taan.* l. c. Hence *Avod. Sar.* f. 25, 1: *traditio, sicut sol constitit Josuæ, sic quoque constitit sol Mosi et Nicodemo fillo Gorionis.* But his house suffered much by the destruction of Jerusalem: his daughter gathered barley-corns ex stercore jumentorum Arabum, and Jochanan ben Zakkai cried out when she mentioned her name: *quid fit de divitiis patris tui!* *Chetub.* l. c. Though there is here so much that is mythical, we shall not err if we assume that this Nicodemus was at any rate an historical person belonging to the last days of Jerusalem, a Jew and by no means a Christian; wherefore it is quite inadmissible to connect him with Bonai, the disciple of Jesus, a connection which is not found in the Talmud itself. On the other hand, it is extremely easy to conceive of a fictitious Christian appropriation of this renowned Jew, an appropriation which would be quite analogous to that of Gamaliel (Clem. *Recogn.* 1, 65: Gam. princeps populi, qui *latentur* frater noster erat in fide, sed consilio nostro inter eos (Judæos) erat), or that of the procurator Pilate. It is noteworthy that in Phot. *Cod.* 171 (on the authority of Eustratius) Nicodemus is made a nephew of Gamaliel, with whom he is baptized by John and Peter (comp. Winer, *Gamaliel*). Significant enough is here (1) the entire ignorance of the earlier Gospels of Nicodemus, who occupied too prominent a position to have been forgotten; (2) the suspicious parallelism of Joseph and Nicodemus; (3) the description of Nicodemus as a merely secret friend (*latenter frater*) of Christianity, even more retiring than the secret friend Joseph (John xix. 38 sq.); (4) the points of contact between the Nicodemus of the Talmud and that of John: a rich man, John xix. 39, also a leader of the Jews (*ἀρχων τῶν Ἰουδ.* iii. 1, magnus urbis), a Sanhedrist, vii. 50, a Pharisee, iii. 1, vii. 50, evidently also an elder in Israel, iii. 4, a teacher, nay, the authority of Israel, iii. 10, one who recognizes the greatest performer of miracles, iii. 2, though himself (in the Talmud) a performer of miracles; at the same time he was still a Jew who, despite his visit—which was only a nocturnal one—to Jesus, remained true to Israel, iii. 10, did not receive the testimony, iii. 11, was not born again from above, iii. 3, therefore did not see the kingdom of God, iii. 3, 5, and in the destruction of Jerusalem and in the loss of his enormous wealth experienced the truth of the principle that what is born of the flesh is flesh, iii. 6, and passes away with the flesh, 1 John ii. 16 sq. From

him appear Magdalene, Salome, the mother of Jesus, and John, and the author exerts himself to give a worthy description of the outburst of feeling on the part of Jesus's mother, Magdalene, and Joseph at the sepulchre. Magdalene heroically declares she will go to the emperor at Rome; Jesus's mother recalls with tears the solemn prediction of Simeon, but is consoled with the recollection of her Son's prophecy that he should rise again in three days.¹

It was doubtless at the grave that those arrangements for a careful and appropriate sepulture were made, which the Gospels in their hasty account appear to transfer to the place of execution: the wrapping in linen, according to the earlier sources, a formal embalming, according to John.² The former would be possible rather than the latter, if it were not difficult to think of the blood-stained corpse of Jesus with a winding-sheet of clean fine linen, or to transfer to the place of execution the washing which would be a preliminary, and was invariably performed by the Jews for the sake of ceremonial purity.³ In the

the whole we infer: Nicodemus, like Gamaliel, is a Christian appropriation of the second century, probably not only of the fourth Gospel. The greater the name that was handed down to the second century out of the last history of the falling Jerusalem, the more valuable would he be as a Jewish witness for Christ (and thereby, according to his name, "victor of popular opinion"), and also as a counter witness against Israel and himself. This remarkable phenomenon has hitherto been overlooked; the critics of the fourth Gospel have ignored it, Strauss, 4th ed. I. p. 659, having simply assumed an invention of the "ruler of the people" in reply to Celsus's reproach (Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 62) of the discipleship of only publicans and mariners (Scholten, p. 269, also passes very rapidly over this), and the defenders of the fourth Gospel having merely thought of a combination of the two. Following the lead of Alting, Lightfoot, and Wetst., Ewald (p. 342) and Renan (15th ed. p. 228) have assumed the general identity, without going into the question in detail. Finally, Noack, I. pp. 198 sqq., 241, makes the retrograde advance of explaining the Nicodemus of the fourth Gospel as a Galilean Pharisee, a friend of Jesus, and author of the "Psalms of Solomon"!

¹ *Acta Pil.* B. 11. In A. only Joseph appears, as in the Synoptical tradition; Nicodemus first before the Sanhedrim, c. 12.

² Matt. xxvii. 59; Luke xxiii. 53; Mark xv. 46; John xix. 38 sqq. Sindon (καθαρά, only Matt.), Sanscrit, sindhu, Hebr. sadin, especially renowned tyria et egyptia (Wetst. p. 542). Pollux, 7, 72: περιβόλαιον, το νῦν ἐκκροσσον καλούμ.

³ Acts ix. 37 (v. 6, 10). *Shabb.* f. 151, 1: ungunt et lavant mortuum (Lightfoot, p. 565). This custom not only existed throughout the whole of antiquity (Wetst. p. 515), but it was fully in harmony with Jewish usages, and is to be taken for

haste of the burial and in view of the dark tragedy of the fate of Jesus, everything would be done as simply as possible. After the washing, the head—to which a last kiss might have been given as a pledge of unending love—was wrapped in a napkin, and the whole body, the arms, and the feet, were wound with broad bands of linen cloth, which Mark must be wrong in saying that Joseph had then to fetch from the merchant. For securing the bands, gum may have been used on the inner side, as in Egypt.¹ The great question is whether, after the washing, Jesus was honoured with an anointing or with spices and perfumes. The oldest, and here again the clearest, account, neither mentions anything of the sort nor indicates any preparation for the performance of such acts on a subsequent day.² According to Luke, the Galilean women, after the burial on Friday or (according to Mark) on Saturday evening, before the beginning or at the close of the Sabbath, prepared spices and oil of myrrh with which subsequently to anoint the corpse, but the resurrection made this anointing impracticable.³ According to John, a rich gift by Nicodemus, who brought a hundred pounds of aromatic stuffs—a mixture of myrrh-gum and odorous aloe-wood—made it possible at the burial to complete the wrapping of the corpse

granted in the case of a blood-stained corpse. In all the sources, particularly in John xix. 40 sq., it is made to appear that these acts were performed at the place of execution.

¹ Napkin, John xi. 44, xx. 7. *Midr. Till.* 16, 2: non vocati sunt sancti, donec terræ essent conditi, *sudario* velatis ipsorum faciebus. Wetst. p. 919. The last kiss, Gen. xlv. 4, l. i. (comp. Tobit xiv. 1 sqq.). *Mart. Pal.* 11. Strips of *sindon* among the Egyptians and Persians, Herod. 2, 86; 7, 181 (τελαμῶνες κατατετυμμένοι), comp. John xi. 44 (κεφαλαί about the feet and hands), and xix. 40, xx. 7 (ῥθόνα, linteola). Though we might infer from the Synoptics, and also from the Gospel of the Hebrews (dominus quum dedisset sindonem suam servo sacerdotis), that one large piece of linen was used (Winer), yet the prevailing custom is here decisive, and *κατελίσσω* (comp. the Synoptics) is the term. techn. in Herodotus for winding in strips. Egyptian burial usages among the Jews, attested generally by Tac. *Hist.* 5, 3. Comp. *Megill.* f. 26, 2. Lightfoot, p. 564. *Hier. Terum.* 8: involutus maneat mortuus in sindone sua, Wetst. p. 542. Gum, Herod. 2, 86. Seller, Mark xv. 46.

² Matt. xxvii. 59 sq., comp. xxviii. 1.

³ Luke xxiii. 56, xxiv. 1; Mark xv. 47, xvi. 1. Luke mentions ἀρώμ. κ. μύρα, Mark only the former. Luke places the preparation on Friday evening, Mark postpones it until Saturday evening when the sweet spices were bought.

and to fill out the linen bands with aromatic substances according to the Jewish custom.¹

But these additions by the later sources possess little probability. It is true that the embalming of the dead was known among the Jews, although in a simpler form than among the Egyptians; and professional embalmers are mentioned in the Old Testament.² Especially at the burial of kings great quantities of aromatic substances were burned; in the funeral procession of king Herod there were five hundred servants with sweet spices.³ This was a part of the last honours of the dead, and was associated with splendid robes and coffins and costly sepulchres, such as are described in later times at the death of Alexander Jannæus, Aristobulus the pretender, Aristobulus the high-priest, Herod the Great, and Poppæa the wife of Nero.⁴ Even Gamaliel the elder, the leader of the Pharisees, is said to have been honoured by the proselyte Onkelos with the burning of above eighty pounds of balsam at his death.⁵ On the other hand, this, even in lesser proportions, was by no means the prevailing custom at the death of ordinary persons, as John himself shows in his account of the death of Lazarus; and at a hurried burial, especially when that was the burial of one who had been executed, such attentions and such honour were out of the question. Even in the days of the ancient kings, popular opinion refused these funeral honours to many rulers.⁶ If it be said that love

¹ John xix. 39.

² Egyptians, Herod. 2, 86. So far modified, Tac. *Hist.* 5, 3. The Old Testament mentions the physicians (rophëim) or anointers (rokeach), Gen. 1. 2; 2 Chron. xvi. 14. The LXX., in the former passage, *ἐνταφιασταί*.

³ Jer. xxxiv. 5; 2 Chron. xxi. 19. Jos. *B. J.* 1, 33, 9; *Ant.* 17, 8, 3. Comp. also Wetst. pp. 249, 957.

⁴ Comp. Jos. *Ant.* 13, 16, 1 (Jannæus); 14, 7, 4 (Aristobulus); 15, 3, 4 (high-priest); 17, 8, 3 (Herod); Tac. *Ann.* 16, 6 (Poppæa). Sometimes mention is made of *θυμιάμ*. (*Ant.* 15, 3, 4), sometimes of *ἀρώμ*. (17, 8, 3), and sometimes of honey (14, 7, 4).

⁵ *Massachet Semachot*, 8, in Wetst. p. 957.

⁶ John xi. 39. Of persons executed (particularly for blasphemy), Jos. *Ant.* 4, 8, 6: ὁ δὲ βλασφημίας θεὸν καταλευσθεὶς κρεμάσθω δι' ἡμέρας καὶ ἀτίμως καὶ ἀφανῶς θαπτέσθω. Comp. *Ant.* 17, 7: *ἄσμοι ταφαί*. In the Old Test., comp. Jer. xxxiv. 5; 2 Chron. xxi. 19.

would easily overcome these difficulties, on the other hand the contradiction of the sources cannot be got rid of. One can detect in a moment that the amplification of the account is progressive from Matthew down to John. As to the embalming, the preferable statement is that of Luke and Mark, which postpones it until the close of the Sabbath. But even this, besides being contradicted by Matthew, is untenable and fictitious, since—as even the Rabbins show—the commencing Sabbath would by no means have made the anointing unlawful, while, on the other hand, neither the burier nor the prevailing usage would allow of any supplementary act after the sepulture had been completed and the stone finally placed before the grave. Yet here we have the surprising statement that the women, contrary to custom and without the co-operation of the legal owner of the sepulchre, on their own responsibility and with more than womanly courage, had resolved to pay this supplementary honour to their dead Master.¹ Finally, no credence can be given to John's exaggerated account, according to which the embalming was decided upon and carried out betimes, and that—since the earlier sources had been silent as to the historical Joseph—by the unhistorical rich Jew, Nicodemus (of whom we know enough), and with a profuseness which outvied the obsequies of the great Gamaliel and the zeal of the proselyte disciple, and have made it necessary to call in the aid of superabounding love or the pompous burials of kings Asa and Herod, in order to explain it.² This, however,

¹ Last duty to the dead permitted, see Shabb. f. 151, 1: præstant omnia necessaria mortuo (sabbato), unguent et lavant eum proviso hoc, ne quod membrum ejus moveant. According to *Hier. Ber.* f. 2, 2, work on the Sabbath did not become sin for which sacrifice was to be offered, until more than one star could be seen in the sky. Lightfoot, p. 565. The stone before the sepulchre (comp. John xi. 38) speaks for itself, not only in Matt. xxvii. 60, but also in Luke xxiv. 2 and Mark xv. 46, xvi. 3. *It was an absolute rule* that the grave should not be opened again, postea quam lapide sepulchrali clausum est, see Buxt. p. 438. This stone was not placed before the grave until the third day, when the face of the dead had become unrecognizable through decay (Wetst. p. 639); but in this case the sepulture was concluded on the first day.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 556 sqq., shows the climax, as well as the futility of attempts to remove the contradictions. The λίτρα has been thought to be very small, according to Michaelis one-eighth of a pound, while, on the other hand, Hug has

is justified only so far as the wish to see Jesus the Crucified honoured to the same degree as a rich man, a nobleman, a king, was the father of the unhistorical additions to the narrative. But he did not need this: as he was, he was very different from a Theodorus of Cyrene even if he had lain unburied, and he received all the honour he wished for from men when his body was received into Joseph's safe resting-place. Moreover, he himself had at the Bethany meal declared that the anointing by Mary was to take the place of an anointing after death.¹

Therefore, after the corpse in its linen wrappings had been taken through the low entrance on the level ground and placed in the sepulchral niche, the simple, solemn, and affecting act was closed, the buriers retired, the living withdrew from the dead; but in doing so, since there was no door to the sepulchre, they rolled into the entrance, according to Jewish custom, a great block of stone, the so-called *Golal*, which was to protect the dead from evil men and from wild beasts.² The Galilean women were longer attracted by the sepulchre whose tenant, though he could no longer speak, was theirs so long as he was but near them; they sat down in front of the grave, their ears longing to

reckoned it two-thirds. The mass has reminded critics (Langen, p. 359) of Asa (2 Chron. xvi. 14) and Herod (see above); finally, the question whether there was room enough near the corpse for so many pounds, has been met by the assumption of pulverized spices (Meyer). The superabundance of love (Olsh., Tholuck, Strauss), and the complete fulfilment of the Isaiah prophecy, in Steinm. p. 240. According to Noack, I. p. 250, Joseph and Nicodemus (knowing Jesus's plan as to his death) had previously supplied themselves with what was requisite.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 12; above, V. p. 264 (comp. ἐλπίς ταφῆς, B. J. 4, 6, 3). Theodorus, above, p. 250.

² On the level ground, comp. Mark xvi. 5. Θύρα, Matt. xxvii. 60, &c., is simply entrance, opening (in Homer, *e. g.*, of a cave). Very great stone, Mark xvi. 4. This is simply the Jewish *Golal* which is often mentioned by the Talmudists, "antequam claudatur golal super eo," Buxt. p. 437. It is properly called roll-stone (comp. eben gelal, large squared stones, Ezra v. 8, &c.). Bartenora: lapis magnus et latus, quo obturant vel claudunt os sepulcri superne. According to Maimonides, it could also be ex ligno, alia materia. See Buxtorf, who, however, in his impartial account in which he makes reference to the Gospels, does not think of the difficulties for Luke and Mark.

hear him and their eyes to behold him, even after all around had grown still and dark.¹

Yet another word will Matthew tell us about the grave, though in reality the writer here is not the Evangelist but the later editor.² On the next day, therefore on the Sabbath, an imposing deputation of high-priests and Pharisees went to Pilate, telling him that the "deceiver" had foretold he would rise again after three days, and asking that the grave might be guarded for the next three days against an attempt by the disciples to steal the body: "They might carry away the corpse, make the people believe he had risen again, and thus the last deception would be worse than the first." Pilate is said to have at once placed a guard of soldiers—according to the Acts of Pilate, five hundred men, i.e. the well-known cohort—at their disposal, and to have left further precautions to the petitioners, who then, with the aid of the soldiers, placed a seal between the stone and the entrance to the grave, as king Darius did on Daniel's den of lions.³ This narrative is not elsewhere corroborated, and is altogether improbable. Admitting that this idea may have subsequently occurred to the foes of Jesus—for they must have already protested

¹ Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 47; Luke xxiii. 55. Scholten (p. 239) finds Matt. too dramatic; but he makes no objection to the very similar trait in Mark xv. 40. This is the famous impartial criticism!

² Matt. xxvii. 62. Attested since Justin, *Trypho*, 108; Tert. *Apol.* 21; *Spect.* 30; Orig. on Matt. 145; Lact. 4, 19. Repeated in *Acta Pil.* 13. *Pilat. ad Claud.* Tisch. p. 394. The marks of the second hand (similarly, already Stroth, Kern, Hilg.), above, I. pp. 82 sq. Here must every one (even Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 561) see how in the interpolation (xxvii. 62—66), first, the description of the Sabbath (verse 62) is an inverted one and strikingly different from that in xxviii. 1; next, how the admirable connection between xxvii. 59—61 and xxviii. 1 (comp. verse 57: *ὁψίας δὲ*, and xxviii. 1: *ὁψὲ δὲ*) is broken in upon; finally, how the conclusion of this interpolated incident (xxviii. 11—15) gives rise to very great doubts (see below). On the other hand, Strauss, II. pp. 562 sqq., has (with Paulus, III. ii. p. 837) rejected the supposition of the work of an editor, and held that Luke and Mark found this incident in Matthew, but passed it over in view of the supplementary embalmment, which would not have been possible had they admitted this passage. However, Strauss has rejected the incident, as Paulus had already done. Thus also Bunsen, p. 417. Scholten, p. 231.

³ Daniel vi. 17. Joseph was also sealed up, *Acta Pil.* 15.

against his being buried by his friends—yet it is certain that the Sanhedrists had as little knowledge of the predictions of Jesus as the people had ; and it is quite evident that, even supposing Jesus had privately spoken of a resurrection or of anything akin to it, the disciples themselves had no expectation whatever of a resurrection.¹ Very improbable also sounds the statement that the Sanhedrists desecrated the Sabbath by a visit to a Gentile house and by engaging in the work of affixing the seal ; as does also the statement that Pilate showed himself thus ready to accede to the wish of these hated opponents in the trial, nay, of Jews of any kind, that he indeed by grave military measures which would make himself and the troops ridiculous, gave support to a wish that in his judgment would at any rate be a foolish and absurd one.² The issue of the whole incident will be seen to be still less possible. Here everything is explained by the desire of later Christianity to get rid of the later Jewish objection to the resurrection of Jesus—viz., that the disciples stole the corpse and that Christianity had flourished by means of the deception—by a subtle, and yet futile, proof of its impossibility.

Thus many of the details of these accounts of the burial have to be given up ; and yet things did not so happen that a radical criticism, supported though it be by several somewhat sagacious observations, can call in question the fact of an honourable sepulture. It has recently been boldly asserted that, according to the earliest testimony of the Apostle Paul and of the Revelation of John, Jesus either was interred in a criminal's grave at the place of execution, or remained for days unburied ; and that the Gospels first built for him the grave of honour and glory by

¹ Steinm. p. 249 : what if the Pharisees remembered Matt. xii. 39 sq. ? Similarly, Krabbe, p. 510.

² Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 72, here finds—after Credner, *Beitr.* I. pp. 406 sqq.—the account in the Gospel of the Hebrews more original, that a Jewish watch, and no heathen one, was placed before the grave, inasmuch as the rising Jesus gave his *sin donem servo sacerdotis*. But it cannot be determined whether the Gospel of the Hebrews placed *merely* servants of the high-priest before the grave (comp. John xviii. 3). Thus also Volkmar, p. 633.

applying to him the passage in Isaiah about the suffering servant of God, and by making the words about that servant's equality in death with the deceitful and righteously punished rich, to refer literally to a death or a burial "with the rich," whence by a natural process the portrait of the rich Joseph, the owner and giver of the grave, derived its features.¹ Although this might be supported by the observation that in a sermon ascribed to Paul in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as by Tertullian in the second century, and by Tertullian's imitator Lactantius in the fourth century, the burial of Jesus is described—at least apparently, for the description is very indistinct—as having been performed by his foes; and although it might be still further supported by the supposition that Arimathæa may have been mentioned as the home of Joseph, because, according to the prophet Jeremiah, the cruel destiny of death was to call forth a voice of lamentation in Ramah-Bethlehem; yet a sober judgment, which even Strauss has tolerably well preserved, cannot subscribe to these surmises, the last of which, indeed, is at once disposed of by the difference between Arimathæa and Ramah.²

For—to go into details—it is arbitrary, in the face of Paul, who repeatedly speaks of the burial of Jesus, to question the general fact of that burial. Again, it is arbitrary to find in what Paul says any suggestion of a criminal's grave. Once more, it is arbitrary to apply literally to Jesus the prophecy in the Revelation of the two preachers of repentance at Jerusalem, whose

¹ Beginning of the scepticism in Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 554; *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 396, 431, II. p. 395. Developed by Volkmar, *Rel. Jesu*, pp. 77 sqq., 257 sqq., *Evangel.* p. 603, where mention is made of the "unquestionableness" of insult even after death. Comp. Is. liii. 9; Rev. xi. 8. Similarly, Grätz, p. 245; Renan, 15th ed. p. 445. Commended as a spirited surmise by H. Schultze, *Zeitstimmen*, 1871, p. 1. Rejected by Holtzm. *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 529. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 299.

² Acts xiii. 29. Tert. *Apol.* 21: tunc Judæi detractum et sepulcro conditum magna etiam militaris custodiæ diligentia circumsederunt. Similarly, Lact. *Inst.* 4, 19. Naturally this compendious narration proves nothing; and Acts iii. 15, opp. ii. 23, also ascribes the crucifixion to the Jews in the same general way. On Ramah, comp. Matt. ii. 18, where the name is used in distinction from Arimathæa (above, p. 259).

bodies were to lie in the streets of the city three days unburied until they were resuscitated by God; for the only points of comparison between these dead witnesses and Jesus are those of their execution, resurrection, and ascension; whilst the lying dead in the streets of Jerusalem, as happened in many cases during the administration of the Zealots after A.D. 68, is inapplicable to Jesus, since at the worst he would have remained hanging upon the cross, and that outside of Jerusalem.¹ Not only is the burial in itself beyond doubt, and the lying of Jesus's dead body upon the place of execution—of which Volkmar thinks—an unhistorical monstrosity in view of the copious knowledge we have of the customs and opinions of the Jews, but it must be further admitted that nothing positive can be learnt from Paul concerning the kind of burial, whether that of a criminal or an honourable interment (although Paul would rather lead us to suppose the latter), and that the burial of the executed, by the executioners themselves or by their own friends, in caves or under mounds of stones, later in special burying-places, is well attested from the Old Testament down to the Talmud.² It is nevertheless easy to decide what kind of burial was granted to Jesus. The circumstances were such, that only the executioners or his relatives and friends could bury him. The executioners, however, were not Jews, but Romans, whose custom it was to allow the crucified to hang instead of being buried. It is worthy of note how completely the above-mentioned rash

¹ Grave of Jesus, 1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4. Comp. Rev. xi. 8, and above, p. 251, n. 2. Even as to Paul, Volkmar (p. 617) fancies he could have thought only of a criminal's grave. But how reasonable it would then have been to allow the *ἀρμυρα* of 1 Cor. xv. 43 to appear already in xv. 4.

² Unquestionableness of the burial, see Jos. *B. J.* 4, 5, 2; 4, 6, 3; *Ant.* 4, 8, 6. Comp. above, p. 251, and from the Talmud particularly *Sanh.* c. 6, hal. 5: quicumque mortuum pernoctare facit insepultum, violat præceptum prohibitivum. Caves, heaps of stones, Josbua vii. 26, viii. 29, x. 27; comp. Winer. Prophet Urijah buried in the graves of the common people (*kibre bene haam*), Jer. xxvi. 23. Special burial-places for persons executed, *Tract. Sanh. l.c.*, immediately after the above passage: atqui humatio interfecti a synedrio non fuit in sepulcris patrum ejus; sed duo sepulcra erant parata a synedrio, unum occisis gladio et strangulatis, alterum lapidatis et combustis. Exactly similar, *Sanh. f.* 46, 1. See Lightfoot, pp. 389, 719.

assumption has overlooked the simplest historical fundamental presupposition, viz., that the crucified would be left hanging, not lying, and not buried by the executioners as critics have dreamed. Those who buried Jesus must therefore have been his friends, since the Jews could not be compelled to do so, and certainly would not do so voluntarily. Thus we are already in the wake of the Gospels. But what if these merely borrow their details from Isaiah? This also is quite an arbitrary assumption, for by a crudely literal application of the words of Isaiah could be developed at most a grave with a dead Joseph or with David and Solomon—in truth, according to the text only the antithesis of all that was honourable, namely a grave among the godless and the wicked rich, therefore in this case a criminal's grave; and this only by a most childish misunderstanding of a passage clear to the weakest intellect, a passage in which a tomb with the rich—that is, according to the common usage of the words, with the wicked—was described as an undeserved adverse fate. No art, no word-play, could convert the “rich man” of Isaiah into the living figure of a Joseph of Arimathæa, of the aged disciple with his unused grave.¹ Hence there remains to the Lord his Joseph's grave, his honourable burial; and criticism leaves him at least his grave and his rest.

B.—THE RESURRECTION.

Every other human life has finished with the earth at death, and it is an axiom of both ancient and modern mankind that the dead do not rise again.² Indeed, the elder Pliny finds a melan-

¹ Is. liii. 9: and he gave his grave with the *godless*, and his sepulchral mound with (a) *haughty* (one), *although* he had done no wrong. *Ashir*, rich, already = wicked in the Old Test., see Gesenius. At the close, instead of *bemotav* (in his death, comp. Ez. xxviii. 10) should be read *bamotav* (his sepulchral mound, comp. Ez. xliii. 7). The LXX. reads differently. See also Oehler, in *Herzog*, IX. p. 421. But Steinmeyer, pp. 240 sq., held that *ashir* is not a godless man, and that Isaiah must have been fulfilled. Weiss, p. 506: Matt. according to Isaiah!

² Cic. *Verr.* 5, 49: quasi ego excitare filium ejus ab infernis possem! Athenæus, VIII. p. 336: ὁ γὰρ θανόντων τὸ μηδεὶν ἔστι καὶ σκιά κατὰ χθονός. Wetst. II. p. 169.

choly consolation for all the weaknesses of men in the thought that even God cannot awaken the dead.¹ The posthumous influence of a man for tens and thousands of years is not in question; but it is no longer his personality, it is the spiritual, moral, human truth, freed from the material limitations of the individual life, it is this truth which in its own name and in that of its representative enjoys immortality upon earth. Tradition makes a difference in the case of Jesus; to him there was deliverance from death upon the earth itself, and, when he departed, his posthumous influence also became a perpetual one.²

This tradition has been vigorously attacked from the beginning until now by Jews and heathens, and at last by Christians also. Formerly the attack was prompted by hatred, now by the love

¹ Pliny, *H. N.* 2, 5: nec mortales æternitate donare aut revocare defunctos.

² The earlier literature on the resurrection in Hase, pp. 269 sqq., and Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 570 sqq. Besides the works on the life of Jesus, the recent writings that deserve to be specially mentioned are (on the basis of Strauss and Baur) Karl Holsten, "Paul's Vision of Christ" in the *Hilg. Zeitschr.* 1861, pp. 223 sqq.; Noack's "Resurrection of the Crucified One in the Light of Modern Scientific Psychology," 1861, pp. 133 sqq.; Ed. Güder's "Reality of the Resurrection of Christ and the Attacks upon it," 1862, comp. A. Schweizer in the *Prot. K.-Z.* 1862, pp. 273 sqq.; Ludw. Paul's "Historical Establishment of a Real Resurrection of Jesus," in *Hilg. Zeitschr.* 1863, pp. 182 sqq. Then Strauss in the same *Zeitschr.* pp. 386 sqq., and Paul's reply to Strauss, *ib.* 1864, p. 82. Hilgenfeld's "Last Word on the most Recent Essays on the Resurrection of Christ," *ib.* p. 95. Hilgenfeld's "Conversion and Apostolic Vocation of Paul," *ib.* p. 155. Ludw. Paul's reply to Hilgenfeld's "Last Word," *ib.* p. 396. Herm. Gebhardt's "Resurrection of Christ and its most Recent Opponents," 1864. Luthardt's "Modern Representation of the Life of Jesus," 1864. Beyschlag's "Conversion of the Apostle Paul, with special Reference to the Expository Attempts of Baur and Holsten," in *Stud. und Krit.* 1864, pp. 197 sqq. My own "Historical Christ," 2nd ed. 1865, 3rd ed. 1866. Just. Heer's "This is the Victory," 1865, p. 111. Albert Billroth's "Resurrection of Jesus and Dr. Strauss," 1866. Krüger's "Resurrection of Jesus in its Significance for the Christian Belief," 1867. Holsten's "On the Gospel of Paul and of Peter" (a new edition of his work on "Paul's Vision of Christ," together with a fresh work on Peter's vision of the Messiah), 1868. Alb. Reville, *La resurr. d. J. Chr.* 1869. Fred. Godet, *L'hypothèse des visions; reponse à M. Reville*, 1869. Krauss, *Lehre v. d. Offenb.* 1869. Scholten, *Aelt. Ev.* 1869, pp. 225 sqq. Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, 1870, pp. 197 sqq. Beyschlag's "The Vision-Hypothesis in its most Recent Form," in *Stud. und Krit.* 1870. Steimmeyer's "Resurrection-History of the Lord," in his *Apolog. Beitr.* III. 1871. [In this note I have departed from my usual course, and have translated the titles of the German works mentioned, where those titles are specially explanatory of the work.—*Trans.*]

of truth.¹ "You laugh at the worshippers of Zeus, because his tomb is shown in Crete," cried Celsus to the Christians, "and yet you yourselves adore him who came out of the grave, not knowing how it is the Cretans do the same."² As a result of these attacks, historians began to refer the report of the resurrection to the age of the Apostles; as if it were expedient to forsake a sinking ship, to renounce on behalf of Jesus a fact which, with all its extraordinary character, appeared superfluous for him, and to leave to the disciples the defence and vindication of their faith.³ Others have defended the resurrection of Jesus against scoffers, doubters, and men of weak faith, as the most certain fact of history, as the strongest or indeed the only and last bulwark of Christianity. So much zeal has been shown here that the doubter has barely escaped alive from the embrace of this hatred, with the sacrifice of his Christian title and his civil honour.⁴ Calm and unbiassed reflection will enable us to comprehend as easily this strength of feeling, as the prudence of the many disciples of Erasmus who do not wish to burn in this fire. Yet the way of truth remains the best; and though we may approach with anxiety and sadness a question which appears—and in part is—as enigmatical as it is momentous, yet it is with the truth that we shall finally serve not only the God of the conscience, but also mankind.

To think to find a smooth and even path through this history

¹ Comp. Matt. xxvii. 64; Acts xvii. 18 sqq. Celsus, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 55, &c.; Lucian, death of Peregr. 13; and others. The Gnostics, as a rule, deny at least the resurrection of the flesh, e.g. the Sethites (Anger, p. 259); they generally appeal to 1 Cor. xv. 50. Irenæus, 5, 9, 1; comp. 5, 31, 1 sqq.

² Origen, *Con. Cels.* 3, 43.

³ Thus Ewald and Renan, recently also Holtzm. and Hausr. Weiss, *Mark.* p. 511, refers back this view to Mark (Mark xvi. 8). Denial only by Renan.

⁴ Despite all the great difficulties that beset this subject, such a high degree of certainty has been expressed, not only by Press. p. 659, Gebhardt, p. 78, Riggensbach, and Lange (Philistinish pretensions, Hase, p. 271), but even by Theile, p. 69; Thol. p. 310; Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 75; Volkmar, p. 612. One can do this the more easily when one thrusts his own opinion upon the scriptural account. Unhappy consequences for deniers, Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 397.

of the resurrection is a great mistake, unworthy of a cultured, thoughtful, truth-loving man. The resurrection of Jesus is one of the best attested incidents in the New Testament; the details, however, swarm with contradiction and myth, and are the worst attested of any—the stories of Jesus's childhood not excepted—in all the sources.¹ The more than “ten contradictions” which are to be found here, have been, since the days of Celsus, and especially since Lessing wrote his reply to the Hamburg pastor Goeze (1778), repeatedly adduced; and if we were not required to glance at them, we could very gladly dispense with the task of reproducing them.² According to one account, the resurrection took place on Saturday evening; according to the others, on the Sunday morning. It was accompanied by an earthquake, or occurred only by the aid and in the presence of one or two angels, who were visible or invisible, sitting or standing, within or without the tomb, talking of this or that. It was seen by men, by women, or by keepers of the sepulchre; or it was not seen, only subsequently discovered by women, also by Peter, or by Peter and John. The person of Jesus is met first by one, two, or three Galilean women with different names, also by more than these three; or by Galilean men; or finally by only the Apostles. According to some accounts, Jesus appeared to his followers in Galilee; according to others, he appeared to them at Jerusalem; he gave his last, in part very contradictory, instructions on a hill in Galilee, or on the Mount of Olives near Jerusalem. According to some accounts, he simply showed himself; according to others, he was a long time present and ate and talked: according to some, he possessed a material tangible corporeity; according to others, he appeared and disappeared

¹ Whilst Gebhardt (*l.c.* p. 78) does not see much of this, Güder (*l.c.* pp. 12, 16), notwithstanding all his zeal, candidly admits it. Similarly Krauss, p. 221. Steinm. *l.c.* pp. 21 sq., 25, 60, 72 (undemonstrable confession of faith). Also Paul, in *Hilg.* 1863, pp. 183 sqq., renounces the details and retains merely the general fact; comp. Holsten, p. 125. Comp. Hase, p. 271, h. Weizsäcker, p. 570.

² The evidence for the following representations later. Already Celsus (Origen, *Con. Cels.* 5, 56) adduced, *e.g.*, the contradiction in the number of the angels. Lessing's *Duplik*, in his collected works, edition 1841, IX. pp. 94 sqq., comp. pp. 48 sqq., 77 sqq.

in a non-material manner. Once more, according to some he paid only one visit, according to others he paid several. He left the earth either on the very day of his resurrection, morning or evening, or three, or indeed forty, days later, not very long before Pentecost, on a Thursday instead of a Sunday; or finally he was already in heaven when he gave his collective greetings to his followers. These glaring contradictions demand from us, if not absolute resignation, at least moderation and sobriety. And in view of this general confusion, the work, not of harmonistic, which adjusts arbitrarily, and which by its adjustments, from Augustine down to Griesbach and Neander, has lost all credit, but of criticism, which distinguishes old and new, the attested and the unattested, the probable and the fictitious, is to be greeted as a benefit and a blessing. This much-blamed rejected criticism alone is able to construct for these reports a tenable basis, something certain or probable. Lessing, in the midst of all the contradictions which he exposed with an icy calm, did not altogether lose belief in a firm foundation.¹

Our business is to lay hold of what Lessing did not find—the oldest, the most certain testimony. Our Gospels—including the Acts of the Apostles composed by an Evangelist—which so violently contradict each other, have assumed their present form since the destruction of Jerusalem, though earlier sources, even earlier Gospels, may be concealed in them. It is therefore not well to content ourselves with “John the eye-witness,” as was formerly done, or with Mark the favourite of the present; Matthew has a better claim upon our attention, especially if we are able to separate the original writing from the editor’s interpolations.² But the Revelation of John is somewhat older than our

¹ Comp. Lessing, *l.c.* pp. 95, 106, 108, 184. Bleek, II. p. 487. Güder, p. 14.

² John was the firm stay to most, even to Paulus, Theile, and Gebhardt; Mark especially to Schenkel, Scholten, and Volkmar. Yet these go back also to Paul and the Revelation. At the same time there is an inclination to abbreviate the Gospels, particularly Mark, Schenkel, p. 319; Scholten, p. 231; Noack, II. p. 102. Matthew was formerly (Schulz, Schneek.) very contemptuously treated. Strauss also has here cleared away erroneous critical points of view, although a recognition of the interpolations in Matthew did but little for him towards bringing about that result. In II.

present Gospels ; at Easter, A.D. 69, it distinctly announces, and in a tone of triumph, the resurrection of the Lion of the tribe of Judah on the Lord's-day ; but it does not enter into details.¹ Yet there is an older testimony, and in it something which is more definite, going even into particulars.² Eleven years older than the Revelation is the first Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, written at the beginning of Easter, A.D. 58.³ This Epistle points back beyond the year 58 to the year 54, and still further back to the year 39, to a date which was separated by only four years from the great events of the death and resurrection of Jesus. In this Epistle Paul states what he had taught in Corinth from the beginning, that is from the year 54, and what he had experienced and received by tradition from the earliest Apostles and the first Christians, that is at and after his two weeks' visit to Peter in Jerusalem in the year 39.⁴ What he then heard he afterwards found to be established or elucidated in his intercourse with the Apostles and the earliest brethren. He states with especial emphasis that, of the five hundred brethren who had

pp. 579 sq., he was inclined still to subordinate Matt. to Luke and Mark. He was justly perplexed, in p. 638, by the appearance of Jesus at Jerusalem, Matt. xxviii. 9 sq., and in the *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 434, he finally recognizes the (alleged pre-Matt.) interpolation.

¹ Rev. i. 5, 17 sq., ii. 8, v. 5, comp. xi. 11. But these passages show something more than mere immortality (Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. 399), or than the spiritual character of the fact (Volkmar, p. 642). That xi. 8 sq. points to Easter, A.D. 68, is shown above, p. 273. Recent critics place the Apocalypse between A.D. 68—70. Having regard to the references to the emperor, and to certain traces as to time (Tac. *Hist.* 2, 8), as well as to allusions to Easter (i. 7, 10, 18, ii. 7 sq., iii. 20 sq.), I have, above, I. p. 223, dated it Easter, A.D. 69.

² Critics have of late generally gone back to Paul, as Strauss, Baur, Weisse, Holsten, Scholten, and their followers. Yet they mostly begin with the Gospels. Bunsen, p. 473, and Steinmeyer, pp. 165 sq., are indifferent about or even mistrustful of the Pauline testimony.

³ If Paul was arrested in Jerusalem at Pentecost, A.D. 59, which is beyond doubt (comp. my remarks on the succession of Felix and Festus, in my article *Herodier*, in *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 58), then the Epistle to the Corinthians was written in the spring of A.D. 58, more exactly, according to the distinct allusion in 1 Cor. v. 7 sq., before Easter in that year.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 3 sqq. The more detailed investigation of the chronology I reserve for my history of the apostolic age. [A project which the author, unfortunately, was not spared to complete.—*Trans.*]

seen the risen Lord, the greater number were then still alive. He treats of the resurrection in the other Epistles also, particularly in that to the Romans (Easter, A.D. 59), and earliest of all in that to the Galatians (summer, A.D. 54); hence these Epistles are to be added to the list of sources. But the Epistle to the Corinthians contains the most copious disclosures, and these we owe in a remarkable manner to those Corinthian "heretics" who, by denying the resurrection, compelled the Apostle to have recourse to the armoury of his historical evidences.¹ Paul's help supplies the whole question with its fixed point, its Archimedean fulcrum; and the universal conviction of the earliest Christendom acquires the historical basis which gives it certainty and clothes it with flesh and blood. This universal conviction was of itself able to stand against a doubt of its truth; but in the face of the testimony of Paul, the force of such a doubt is doubly lost. Paul wishes in pious earnestness to give the truth, and he has evidently taken pains by exact investigation to remove any obscurity. It will not be said that it was to his interest to prove the resurrection; and that his interest, his credulity, his prejudice—which his belief in his own vision of Christ had already excited in favour of the appearances of Christ to others—made him willing, nay passionately anxious, to register all and every saying and myth, whilst he was fain to pass by divergent voices and facts. Such a suspicion is forbidden by his whole character; by his acute understanding, which was entirely free from fanaticism; by the form of his careful, cautious, measured, plain representation; by the simple, unassuming details—so superior to the highly-coloured accounts in the Gospels—of his statement; and, above all, by the favourable general impression his report produces, and by the powerful corroboration which accompanied it in the clear, consistent, universal belief of early Christendom, and particularly in the testimony of a host of living eye-witnesses. It may be that he did not oppose to this universal belief of the Apostles and disciples the keenness of the criticism of to-day; it

¹ Rom. i. 4; Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 12.

may even be that he—like them, himself a psychologist of antiquity—sought the foundation of those actual occurrences in external instead of in internal spiritual facts; yet it is beyond doubt that the facts were really experienced and believed as they were faithfully related to him, and as he has again faithfully reported them.¹ Thus, as is now generally acknowledged, it is the task of history to give the facts as they are received from the hand of Paul; to accept from the more doubtful sources, the Gospels, whatever is in harmony with Paul; to exclude and to place by itself as glorifying mythical history whatever is contradicted by his representation; and, finally, to attack the momentous question in what light the occurrences are to be regarded, judged, and explained.

1.—*The Facts.*

The point to which Paul directs us is not at first, as in the Gospels, the empty grave, but the revelation of Jesus after the grave. As to the proceedings in and at the grave, he is in the main silent; of the appearances away from the grave, he has expressly and copiously spoken. Thus we shall start from what is more certain, and not from what is intangible.²

These appearances of Jesus took place, according to the plainest evidences, in Galilee, and not at Jerusalem.³ It is true that

¹ Like Volkmar (p. 566), Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 400, depreciates the testimony of Paul: it was by no means based upon objective evidence (Volkmar), upon historical investigation of objective fact (Strauss). Paul has nowhere given a justification to such exorbitant representations. Comp. above, V. p. 186, n. 1.

² Paul speaks of the burial of Jesus in 1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4; but the appearances of Jesus, 1 Cor. xv. 5 sqq., he brings into no immediate connection with the grave. Thus particularly Weisse, II. p. 379.

³ Whilst formerly critics (from Tert. *Ap.* 21, and *Acta Pil.* 13 sqq., down to Paulus, Schleierm., Neander, Bleek, Theile, Krabbe, Ewald, Hase, Rigg., Bunsen, Gess, Steinm., and many others) delighted to mix Jerusalem and Galilee up together, making Jesus first appear at Jerusalem, then (according to Matt. and Mark) go to Galilee, finally (according to Luke and John) ascend to heaven from Jerusalem—whilst they enumerated many things to make the change of place, the going into the freer and remote Galilee, and the close at the metropolis, conceivable—it was left to Strauss (after the doubts of Reimar and Lessing), 4th ed. II. pp. 588 sqq., followed by Weisse, II. p. 358, and Zeller (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1849, pp. 38 sqq.), to reject Jerusalem in favour of the oldest and most genuine tradition, Galilee. Also Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 294.

Paul mentions no locality; but the third manifestation at least, among five which he describes, clearly occurred in Galilee. For no one can think of an assembly of five hundred brethren or like-minded associates at Jerusalem. The Lord had not had so many trustworthy adherents there, and his shameful death had driven the few faithful to flight and to hiding. To think of the subsequent church at Jerusalem is forbidden, not merely by the smaller number of its members, as it is described by the Acts of the Apostles, but also and still more by the then much later date and the changed form of belief, since the resurrection of Jesus was being proved to the five hundred, but had already been proved to the church at Jerusalem.¹ In Galilee, on the other hand, in the land of Jesus's labours, five hundred might easily be collected together in his name. The fugitives from the metropolis—apostles, disciples, adherents—returned; those who had remained at home joined them; hot-blooded Galilee generally was doubtless violently agitated by the outrage at Jerusalem upon the Prophet of the country—very differently from Judæa when Antipas murdered John, or from Galilee itself when Pilate slaughtered those who offered sacrifice at the last Feast of Tabernacles. The recent pang, distress, longing, brought Jesus's adherents together; no danger forbade their meeting; the impression produced by the cross yielded to reminiscences that could not be forgotten, nay, to the first enticing, constraining joy-cry of the Apostles: "The Lord is risen!"² As, according to Paul, one appearance occurred in Galilee, nothing can be plainer than that all the appearances are to be located in the mother

Scholten, p. 228. On the other hand, Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 73 (in honour of the late Gospel of the Hebrews), and Holsten, *Ev. Petr. und Paul.* p. 161, have returned, in a very subjective manner, to the appearances at Jerusalem.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 6, by no means to be identified with Acts i. 15, ii. 1 sqq., as Weisse, II. p. 417, and Volkmar, p. 621, have done. On the other hand, also Gess, pp. 206 sq. But already *Acta Pil.* 14, locates the 500 in Galilee.

² "Into the freer Galilee," Paulus, I. ii. p. 191. The temper of Galilee is not reported, but it can be easily inferred from Luke xiii. 1 sqq. It is remarkable that a Galilean community continued to flourish, and that Capernaum in particular acquired among the Rabbins the reputation of an heretical city; above, II. p. 371. On the breathless flight, see above, p. 31, n. 5.

country of Christianity. Between all the appearances, particularly between the first three, there is evidently a chain of connection, from small to great, from nearest to furthest; and it is not well to think—as recent critics think, including Dr. Paulus, who should have better spared the infirmity of the Lord who, according to his opinion, had awaked from an apparent death—the returning Lord greeted and visited his adherents as he journeyed, after the manner given in the Gospel of John, from Jerusalem to Galilee and back again to Jerusalem.¹ This conclusion is remarkably corroborated by the Gospels. Matthew and Mark, in a word the oldest Gospel tradition, plainly point to Galilee, the angel at the grave telling the women to send the disciples to Galilee to the last meeting. Luke, who had this statement before his eyes, violently distorted it in order to permit the appearances of Jesus to take place at Jerusalem; and to the fourth Gospel, which agrees with Luke, an appendix has been added that honours the disciples with the miraculously renewed fellowship of the Master at the Sea of Galilee instead of at Jerusalem.² The last obscurity as to the locality is cleared away by a glance at what was done by and what befel the disciples after the crucifixion. The Gospels show, not only that all the disciples were absent from the cross, but also that they all fled and were scattered.³ The fourth Gospel has preserved the reminiscence that they fled towards their home, that is towards Galilee.⁴ And the third makes Peter again confirm and perhaps bring together his dispersed, fallen, disheartened colleagues.⁵ This reminiscence is

¹ "The very enfeebled body of Jesus needed nursing and help," Paulus, *L. J.* II. xlii. Venturini represents Jesus as completely exhausted by travelling, "rather borne than led," p. 278.

² Matt. xxviii. 7, 10, xxvi. 32; Mark xvi. 7, xiv. 28. On the distortion in Luke xxiv. 6, comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 595. The subsequent concession to Galilee in the spurious appendix to John xxi. 1 sqq. The harmonizing ingenuity of Paulus, *Ex. Handb.* III. ii. p. 835, finds that, even according to Luke, Jesus, going northwards towards Emmaus, had Galilee as his goal, as the angel had said; but unbelief (even of the Emmaus disciples) kept him back awhile at Jerusalem. Mich. and Kuin. did not find that walks and subordinate journeyings were excluded. Strauss, *l. c.* p. 590.

³ Matt. xxvi. 31, 56, and par. passages.

⁴ John xvi. 32.

⁵ Luke xlii. 32.

also shown by other sources. Justin Martyr, doubtless on the authority of the "Memoirs of the Apostles," thrice asserts that all the acquaintances of Jesus forsook him and dispersed, until the appearances of Jesus recalled them to their adherence and their faith.¹ This dispersion cannot possibly be limited to a hiding in Jerusalem. The natural place of retreat and refuge was that home of Galilee to which Jesus himself retreated when the Baptist was surprised in the south; and what is suggested by the circumstances is confirmed by the express indications of the sources, from Matthew to John. If Galilee was afresh the disciples' place of residence, then it was also the locality of the appearances of Jesus.²

Thus, though Luke and John, and in part even Matthew—notably the editor—locate the appearances at Jerusalem; though even the ancient Matthew and Mark look for the sojourning place of the disciples immediately after the crucifixion at Jerusalem, whence they retreated at the bidding of the angel to Galilee; yet this is evidently not genuine, but coloured, history, and has long been regarded with distrust even in the Church.³ A distinction must be made between Matthew and Mark on the one hand, and Luke and John on the other. The statements of the former two look more credible than those of the latter two. It might be expected of the disciples, particularly of Peter, that they would not entirely forsake their Master, that instead of going to a distance they would await the issue in the neighbourhood, at Jerusalem, though in hiding. Then they would go to Galilee after hearing the women's news; or at least Peter would hasten to his dispersed colleagues with this information, perhaps indeed with the message of his own experience.⁴ But even this

¹ Just. *Ap.* I. 50; *Trypho*, 52, 106.

² On the other hand, most adhere to the opinion that Jerusalem was the natural scene of the first appearances (Krabbe, p. 520). Graf, *Stud. und Krit.* 1869, pp. 533 sqq., assumes that the Apostles remained at Jerusalem until the end of the feast. On the contrary, Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 299.

³ Matt. xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7. The Galilean appearances are emphasized by Tertullian, *Ap.* 21; still more by Lactantius, *Inst.* 4, 19 sq.

⁴ Luke xxii. 32, xxiv. 34.

assumption is opposed both to the definite account and to probability. The complete withdrawal of Peter from the high-priest's palace—to which he had certainly stolen—his perfect invisibility at the crucifixion and at the burial, too plainly reveal an anxiety about his life which could be assuaged only by his following the others in flight to Galilee. Moreover, the full carrying out of the sentence of execution so completely cut off all hope, and so thoroughly aroused the fears of human nature, that a remaining at Jerusalem and a confessedly hopeless waiting seem to be impossible.¹ And why the call to Galilee, if Jesus could or would take his final leave at Jerusalem, at the place of the resurrection?² Is it indeed more probable that Jesus sent to the remote Galilee the disciples that stood at his disposal in the Holy City, or that the fugitives drew him to Galilee? The whole narrative of the journey to Galilee at the bidding of the angel is an untenable myth, but not a myth without ground. This myth was a saving of the honour of the disciples who it is said had not fled, who did not stand by the cross or at the grave and yet waited for the Master; and it was, moreover, the connecting link between the discovery of the empty grave at Jerusalem and the manifestations in Galilee.³

But we regard with a different mistrust the appearances at Jerusalem and the farewell in Luke and John, and (if one will) in the Gospel of the Hebrews. If these authors had done what modern critics are now so ready to do, if they had placed the beginning of the appearances at Jerusalem and the end in Galilee, they would in every way have gained in probability.⁴ This

¹ Yet neither he, nor any of the others, was at home in Galilee as early as Friday or Saturday, as Volkmar (p. 617), against all possibility, imagines. Krabbe (p. 519) reckons five days.

² Thus Schneck. *Urspr. d. 1. Ev.* pp. 17 sq., and Lessing, comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 593.

³ Also Volkmar, p. 621.

⁴ The division is as a rule naturally so made that the first appearances are located at Jerusalem and the close in Galilee; and not only John xxi. (Neander, p. 593), but even part of xx. (xx. 26, Olsh., comp De Wette, *Matt.* p. 310), is made to refer to the last locality. Yet a last return from Galilee to Jerusalem, for a farewell on the Mount

exclusive localization at Jerusalem must, however, open the eyes of the blind. Yet, not only did the friends of the fourth Gospel formerly pity the Galilean narrowness of our Gospels, but recently Hilgenfeld has given expression to the desperate opinion, that according to the oldest source, the Gospel of the Hebrews, Jerusalem was actually the scene of the manifestations of Jesus; that first Matthew and then, in blind imitation, Mark became even in this matter the advocates of Galilee of the Gentiles.¹ He will have to dispense with any assent by others to these assertions; but as to the general question, the decisive verdict was long ago arrived at, that a fictitious transference of the appearances or even of the whole ministry of Jesus to Jerusalem is conceivable, but that such a transference to Galilee is, from the provincial standpoint, inconceivable.² From this point of view, the final judgment of criticism upon the unhistorical character of the fourth Gospel has long since been pronounced; and we are quite clear as to the aims of this Johannine representation, as to these appearances of the risen Lord only at Jerusalem, for here are crowded together a host of grounds of suspicion which cannot be charmed away even by the assumption of two original traditions in the Jerusalem and the Galilean churches.³ In particular, the transference of the post-resurrection scenes to Jerusalem was at any rate more urgent than that of the whole public ministry. It was at Jerusalem, the subsequent metropolis of Christianity, that the victory over the grave was actually won :

of Olives, has been dreamt of, Krabbe, p. 530. Indeed, Volkmar transfers the appearance to the 500, as a Pentecost incident, to Jerusalem.

¹ Gospel of the Hebrews, in Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2 (more in detail below), in Hilg. *Nov. T. c. C.* IV. pp. 17, 29. Then in his *Zeitsch.* 1868, p. 73. Holsten, p. 161.

² Strauss, *l. c.* p. 597.

³ This juxtaposition of traditions was advanced by Ammon (comp. Hase, p. 284), and particularly by K. Köstlin, *Syn. Ev.* pp. 230 sqq.; and Renan has based his narrative upon it. But the most that can be admitted is, that the original narrative of Galilean appearances was *later* supplemented by the Jerusalem myths which would be in part based upon the fact that Jerusalem was the chief seat of Christianity. We are forbidden to think of an original partition of the appearances, particularly by the fact of the flight of Jesus's adherents from Jerusalem, and the speedy following of the women (who, according to Paul, were not witnesses).

it was but a step to collect together there all the evidences of this victory. It was at Jerusalem that the cross stood: it was but a step to exhibit there the whole range of glorification, the triumph of the Son of God, and the certainty of his future entry into the City of God from heaven.

As to the time when the Galilean appearances began, nothing more definite can be determined than that they must have quickly followed the resurrection, which Paul and his authorities fix upon the third day.¹ Without this close approximation, either the belief in the resurrection on the third day, or the belief in the connection of the resurrection at Jerusalem with the appearances in Galilee, would be seriously weakened. Moreover, all the evidences point to a speedy cessation.² The five appearances which Paul enumerates, though they could not well have all occurred on one and the same day, need not have been spread over many days. In particular, the first three appearances—to Peter, to the twelve, to the five hundred—and even that to the brother James, must have occurred in rapid succession; and the second manifestation to the twelve could scarcely have been weeks or months after the first. Here everything, the introductory enumeration, the language, the circumstances, favour a rapid succession; though a difficulty arises when the fifth appearance is followed by a sixth and last, that of the Apostle Paul, which occurred, hardly years, but at least a year, after, and that north of Galilee, near Damascus. Yet this difficulty disappears

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 4. It is quite usual to understand both Paul and the Gospels as placing the first appearance on the third day, which is harmonistic; but he speaks only of resurrection on the third, whilst the appearance on that day is at most possible. Less prudently has Holsten, *Ev. Petr. und Paul.* p. 233, placed Peter's vision on the third day. Comp. Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 429. More will be said below about the third day.

² Strauss, *New Life*, l. c., and Weisse, p. 415, think that no definite conclusion can be arrived at as to the dates; at any rate, says Strauss, the appearance to Paul himself would fall several years later. This latter is itself very questionable: Jesus died in A. D. 35, and it was A. D. 36, at the latest, when Paul passed over to Christianity (above, II. p. 399). Besides, Paul plainly isolates his appearance, the last. In a word, the language, Paul's apologetic, as well as the motive itself—the revelation of the living Lord to his adherents—all suggest little delay.

as soon as we perceive that Paul himself places an interval between this appearance and the previous ones, and that it is personally important to him, in order to establish the authority of his apostolate, to bring his vision of Jesus into as near a connection as possible with the very different appearances of Jesus to the Apostles. The briefness of the period over which the appearances of Jesus extended is confirmed by the other sources. Indeed, the usual period of the appearances is one and the same day. The Revelation of John evidently assumes this, as do the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; with only this difference, that Luke more distinctly makes the day of resurrection also the day of departure, whilst Matthew and Mark are compelled, by the unhistorical calling of the disciples to Galilee, to allow a journey of at least three days to precede the departure.¹ With these sources agrees the ancient Epistle of Barnabas.² It was John that first found it necessary to have a repetition of the week-day of the resurrection, in order to make room for the convincing of the unbelieving Thomas.³ Then Luke quite overstepped the bounds of possibility by adopting a fresh tradition which a late source may have supplied him with, and on the authority of which he—probably to the astonishment of Theophilus, to whom he dedicated his work—followed up the close of his Gospel and its one day, with the beginning of his Acts of the Apostles with its forty last days of Jesus upon earth. This report is altogether mythical, and belongs to the same category as the forty days and years of consecration, probation, and waiting, in Old Testament myth.⁴ This fresh protracted sojourn of Jesus

¹ Rev. xi. 11 sq., comp. i. 10, 17 sq. Luke xxiv. 1—50. Matt. xxviii. 7, 16.

² Barn. 15. Date of this work, above, I. p. 194. So now also Lipsius, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 372.

³ John xx. 26.

⁴ Acts i. 3, xiii. 31. The Old Testament parallels, above, II. p. 307. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 659. On the other hand, it is very questionable whether the prophecy of Ezra is worked in here, as Volkmar assumes; for the forty days of Ezra's retirement (with five writers) previous to his being taken up into Paradise (Vulgate, 4 Esdras xiv. 23 sqq.), have to do with the writing down of his prophecy, and not with his preparation for Paradise or with the instruction of his disciples. Paulus, III. ii. p. 923, gave an artificial calculation based on Daniel.

upon earth—the motive of which was in part the bringing of Easter and Pentecost into connection—had as a consequence that the author of the spurious last chapter of John could with impunity add to the eight days at Jerusalem an indefinitely longer period, during which he could make Jesus appear in Galilee also instead of merely at Jerusalem.¹ From all this it follows that it is both arbitrary and uncritical for Renan to speak of a year of repeated appearances (of which Ewald had already thought), and for Strauss and Weisse to renounce all attempts at estimating the period because Paul's vision is assumed not to have followed until years afterwards.²

The appearances of Jesus are by Paul four times distinctly spoken of as visions. "He appeared to them;" he was seen for them and by them. It is the same expression which Paul and the New Testament generally use for visions that have nothing else in common with the resurrection appearances of Jesus.³ Though this expression is remarkable, yet critics have comforted themselves with the reflection that it does not in truth exclude a speaking of Jesus and his followers, and still less—what is of most importance—a real revelation.⁴ It is correct that Paul had no doubt of the latter; indeed, he had as little doubt of it in his later visions as in the appearances of the risen Lord; and in those

¹ John xxi. 1 sqq.

² Renan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 32—36. Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 95. Strauss and Weisse, see above, p. 287, n. 2.

³ ὡφθῆν Κηφᾶ, 1 Cor. xv. 5; in verses 5—8 this seeing is four times mentioned. Similarly Luke xxiv. 34; Acts xiii. 31. Of the appearances of the glorified Lord to Paul, Acts ix. 17, xxvi. 16. Substant. ὀπτασία, 2 Cor. xii. 1, comp. Acts xxvi. 19: οὐρατός δ., also Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23. Comp. ὄραμα, ὄρασις, Heb. chazon, marah, marot elohim; all these expressions used of appearances of God, the angels, Moses, and Elijah (Matt. xvii. 3). The peculiarity of Paul's expression noticed by Strauss, Baur, Weisse, Schweizer, Schenkel, &c.

⁴ Words of Jesus are not excluded even by Strauss (*New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 416); nor, as it seems, by Weisse (p. 422), who, like Ewald (VI. 3rd ed. p. 84), emphasizes only the subjective character. Also Schenkel, p. 322. Scholten, p. 227, right in part: the original representation knows nothing of *detailed* speeches. They saw Jesus, heard perhaps *a single word*, that was all. The apologists insist upon the non-exclusion of the objective by the idea of vision (Beyschlag: vision of revelation); but also Weizs. p. 572, and others.

later visions also he believed he sometimes heard the words of Jesus.¹ So also the Gospels, particularly Luke, sometimes use Paul's expression or very similar ones, which signify only a seeing; at the same time, however, they undoubtedly assume a speaking of Jesus, and still more a reality, in fact a certain corporeity, of the appearance.² But here there is a marked distinction between Paul and them. Paul, in mentioning the resurrection appearances of Jesus, has determinedly excluded the speaking of Jesus, the sitting and walking together, the eating and handling, every gross representation of a restoration of the previous corporeity of Jesus and of the previous every-day fellowship with the disciples. There is no doubt that he conceived the coming of Jesus to them as exactly similar to Jesus's appearance to him, namely, as a dazzling disclosure of the Lord who no longer sojourned upon earth, but who since his resurrection had been exalted to heaven, and momentarily revealed himself from heaven to his followers in the glorified body of the Son of God.³ The proof of this is to be found in the measured, reserved,

¹ That Paul had no doubt is shown by the connection of ὥφθη with ἐγγήγερται, 1 Cor. xv. 4 sqq., then by the change of ὥφθη into an ἐώρακα in 1 Cor. ix. 1, finally by his faith in his apocalypses, 2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq. Comp. Holsten, p. 11. In the last passage, reference is made to words with which Paul was favoured in addition to visions. Comp. Acts ix. 4, &c., xviii. 9, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23 sq.

² In Luke, besides ὥφθη, xxiv. 34, an ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ, verse 36, comp. ix. 31; Acts i. 3. In Matt. xxviii. 7, 10, ὤψεσθε; 17, ἰδόντες; 18, προσελθών.

³ Thus already Weisse, Gebhardt, Volkmar (who boasts of the discovery, p. 622), and now Holsten, *Er. Petr. und Paul.* p. 9, &c., only that the last, pp. 126 sqq., and Scholten, pp. 225 sqq., as well as Noack, II. p. 102, and previously Weisse, II. p. 379, incorrectly deny the corporeal resurrection from the grave (in the sense of Paul); and contend that not only was the grave-body of Jesus quite indifferent (indeed annihilated!) to Paul, but even Peter and James did not think of such a resurrection. This view has already been rejected by Hase, p. 269; Biedermann, *Dogm.* p. 233; Krauss, *Offenbarung*, p. 200: it fundamentally misrepresents the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection (above, V. p. 173, n. 1), and stands in contradiction to the whole of the Pauline teaching about the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 35 sqq.; 2 Cor. v. 2). On the other hand, it remains that Paul does not identify resurrection and ascension (comp. Rom. viii. 34, x. 6), though he closely connects them (Rom. i. 4, viii. 34), and that he does not expressly deny the view that Jesus had not yet ascended when he appeared to the twelve, though he precludes it in so far as he completely identifies his *own* vision—which he could think of only as that of the heavenly Christ (comp. Acts ix. 3)—with that of the twelve.

parsimonious expression "seen," in contrast to the multiform references made in the Gospels to the every-day details of human life; it is to be found in the definite co-ordination of the appearance to himself with the visions of the Apostles, who must therefore have described their experiences very much as he did his own; it is to be found, finally, in the exact and plain description of the occurrence which had happened to himself. In another place, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, he expressly says of the appearance to himself simply that he had seen the Lord; though he would have been little likely to pass over the words the Lord might have spoken to him—and which, in the Acts of the Apostles, he is really reported to have said—since he could have best established the divine authority which he there wished to establish of his apostolate, if he could speak not only of a seeing, but, like his predecessors, of a commission given to him in words.¹ It is significant, however, that he can tell of words of Jesus only in connection with Jesus's earthly ministry, and once in connection with visions with which he—Paul—was later favoured.² And again, in another passage, in the Epistle to the Galatians, he refers the commission, in which he really believed, not to a voice accompanying a vision, but to an inner revelation from God.³ Here we have a standard by which to measure the statements of the Gospels. Nothing is more conceivable than the endeavour to give to the appearances of Jesus, these effluences of his resurrection, as well as to that resurrection itself, a form as convincing, as true to life, as comprehensive, as tangible as possible. The earlier truth must

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 1, and xv. 4 sqq. Further consideration shows that Paul could not possibly have perceived words like those given, with contradictory variations, in Acts ix. 4 sqq., xxii. 7 sqq., xxvi. 14 sqq. Nothing is gained, therefore, by an appeal to visions with words as in 2 Cor. xii. 4, 9, or Acts xviii. 9, xxiii. 11, or Matt. xvii. 3. But no one will fail to see that Paul would necessarily have made use of such words, when the Jewish Christians made it a special charge against him that the Lord had not spoken with him, had held no intercourse with him (comp. 2 Cor. v. 13, xiii. 3; Clem. *Hom.* 17, 19).

² 1 Cor. vii. 10, 25; 1 Thess. iv. 15; then 2 Cor. xii. 9.

³ Gal. i. 15 sq.

thus reveal itself. These Gospels must thus speak of "visions;" they must describe the coming and going of Jesus as a sudden presence, in spite of closed doors, and as a sudden disappearance; they must exhibit the contradiction, even to a startling degree, that Jesus came now with all the marks of a material personality, then again in a super-material, enigmatical, unknown nature; finally, they must—as will be shown—dispense with both harmony and originality in the words which Jesus is said to have spoken.¹

The appearances were five, neither more nor less, if we deduct that to the Apostle, as we have a perfect right to do.² It is above all evident that Paul supplies the complete list and the definite sequence of the appearances, since he aims at giving an exact and authoritative report and mentions himself. He does not confine himself to the official leaders, to the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord, as distinct from the mere believers including the women; nothing points to such a limitation, and had he wished to confine himself to the leaders, he must have omitted his mention of the 500.³ Quite as little inclined is he merely to mention generally those who were favoured with an appearance, without definitely determining the number of the perhaps repeated revelations for each one; otherwise he would have mentioned the twelve, like the others, only once instead of twice. The order of the sequence itself throws a great deal of light upon the subject. Since Peter, the twelve, the five hun-

¹ Luke xxiv. 30 sq., 34, 36 sqq.; Matt. xxviii. 17; John xx. 14, 19 sqq. On the other hand, Gess (pp. 197 sqq.) speaks of a systematic gradation of both the manifestations and the words of Jesus.

² On the contrary, Ewald (VI. 3rd ed. pp. 95 sq.) and Renan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 32 sqq., believed themselves able to speak of a great number of appearances, only the chief of which Paul gives; and Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 402, at least assumes that Paul omitted the testimony of the women on principle (in accordance with 1 Cor. xiv. 35). Also Meyer on Matt., and Beyschlag, *Stud. und Krit.* 1870, p. 214, thought that Paul does not enumerate all the appearances, but only those seen by the men who were the proclaimers of the fact. As if the five hundred were such! How much more correct the ancient Celsus (Origen, *Con. Cel.* 7, 35: ἅπαξ παραρρήνεις)! Also Steinmeyer, p. 167.

³ On Magdalena, see below.

dred, then James the brother, finally the twelve again, successively enjoyed a sight of Jesus, the communication proceeded from the narrowest and most intimate circles to the broader and more remote, and at the close was once more limited to the twelve, to a last revelation to Jesus's immediate followers. The series is opened by Peter, the most kindred spirit, the most susceptible, the designated head of the community now left to itself; then come those that are nearest to the mind and heart of Jesus, the twelve, followed by the ready hearers and doers among the people of Galilee, the five hundred. Last, and once more subordinated to the true brethren and sisters, Jesus's family—not yet fully come to the faith, perhaps driven still further from it by the stumbling-block presented to flesh and blood by the fate of Jesus—is represented by James, the oldest of the brothers.¹ With these few faintly outlined pictures and traits must we be satisfied, though the gratefully hailed gift, the welcome hint from the mysterious darkness, only entices us to stretch forth the hand for fuller information than the meagre facts which we possess.

But we may still turn to the Gospels in order at any rate to enjoy the pleasure of finding them in harmony with Paul upon several points, though upon others they contradict him, or, notwithstanding their copiousness, are in need of confirmation. The Gospels mention fewer appearances: Matthew and Mark in the primitive form have only one appearance to the twelve; Luke has three, one each to Clopas, Peter, and the twelve; and John has also three, one to Magdalene and two to the twelve. The Acts of the Apostles has added other appearances, as have the later forms of Matthew, Mark, and John. The Gospel of the Hebrews has fabulously placed the appearance to James at the commencement, though Paul has really placed it last.² It is

¹ Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12; 1 Cor. ix. 5. See next note.

² More fully when considering the details. Steinmeyer, p. 167, would apply the James-appearance to James the son of Zebedee, the third favourite disciple, who as the first martyr could not be allowed to fall too far short of Peter and John. Most critics have thought—against Paul and the Gospel of the Hebrews—of James the son of Alphaeus.

satisfactory to find that the Gospels are chary of appearances, and that with all their differences they exhibit the appearance to Peter, to the twelve, and—if one will—to James; that Luke in particular places at the commencement that to Peter—which he alone preserves—perhaps on account of his dependence upon Paul.

It may be asked how it is that the Gospels have lost the more copious series of Paul? As to Matthew and Mark, this is not explained by—as Holsten thinks—antipathy to the Pauline “visions,” to which it is alleged that even the Petrine-Jerusalem appearance is sacrificed, but by the desire to collect into one great picture of the farewell of Jesus the whole outcome of the resurrection of Jesus, the consolation, the commissions, and the promises.¹ Moreover they, as well as the others, had lost all definite knowledge of the details of the several appearances, and hence confine themselves to those revelations which they are able—on the authority of tradition, even though that tradition was not pure—to describe with exactness. As a striking illustration of this, even Luke, the Pauline writer, whilst he devotes only a word to the appearance to Peter, repeats with copious details the unhistorical, though very fine, and among Christians frequently narrated, appearance to Clopas.² Further, it may be

¹ Holsten, pp. 119 sqq., and afresh, pp. 156—160, therefore with emphasis. That the motive which the hypothesis assumes was not operative, is seen at once from the absence of any effort on the part of Matthew to make the appearance of Jesus in Galilee a materially tangible one; on the contrary, Matt. xxviii. 17 sqq., really produces the impression of a vision. In my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 137, I have, with an appeal to Clem. *Hom.* 17, 19 (comp. 2 Cor. v. 13), found the repugnance of the Judaists to the vision of Paul expressed by opposing to that vision, not so much the objectivity of the appearances to Peter, as the historical one year's intercourse of the Apostle with Jesus; and it is strange that Holsten cannot agree with me here.—On the remarkable self-limitation of the Gospels, particularly Matt. and Mark, others have arrived at a different conclusion. Steinm., p. 209, correctly says that Matthew aims at giving a general summary. Volkmar thinks that Mark's plan was to condense all the visions from Peter's to Paul's into the one in Galilee, in which regard is had not only to the twelve, but also, in the commission to go to the heathen, to Paul! He says that Matthew, on his part, exhibits a reaction against the monstrosity of the forty days of Luke (p. 642).

² In this assumption, the old explanation of Griesbach—that every one relates what is best known to himself—is in part recognized. Strauss, II. 4th ed. p. 577.

asked whether Paul really meant to exclude the stories of Magdalene and of Clopas, and, if he did, how are we to understand the formation of these non-apostolic revelations? It is evident that nothing can here be subtracted from the contradiction of Paul. If other believers had really seen appearances of a similar character, Paul could not have passed them over in silence without misleading his readers and curtailing the evidence of the most consolatory truth. If it be alleged that he held—as it were in prevision of the attacks of Celsus, Renan, and Strauss upon Magdalene—the testimony of laymen or of women to be inadmissible, the reply is, that this is not proved, even though he strictly forbade the women of Corinth to speak in the assembly.¹ On the contrary, the non-historical character of both reports is otherwise capable of proof, for it was left for the editor of Matthew and afterwards John to testify to the vision of Magdalene, who, according to the others, saw nothing; and the Clopas story is self-condemned by its picturesque legendary style, and by the fact that it is impossible that the Galilean adherents should take walks in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The only question to be considered, therefore, is that of the rise of such stories. Now it is in the nature of myth to be expansive, to widen the limits of mysteriously self-restricting revelations; and the story of Magdalene in particular shows most instructively that the early Christians were impelled to bridge over the chasm between the resurrection of Jesus and the notoriously later visions of the Apostles, by eye-witnesses who were necessarily not Apostles. But if we look away from the differences and inquire as to the possibility of restoring a clearer picture than Paul's of what is common to his report and the others, an attempt might be made

¹ Strauss' appeal to *mulier taceat in eccl.* is irrelevant, because officiating at divine service and bearing testimony are different things. Paul has elsewhere spoken honourably enough of women, and he received important testimony from the slaves of Chloe (in the same Epistle, 1 Cor. i. 11). If it be objected that it may be with Paul as with John's Gospel, which in xxi. 1 sqq. knows *only* of appearances to the twelve, though it had previously, xx. 11, recognized that to Magdalene, it may be answered that John xxi. presupposes xx., and it is not the intention of the author of xxi. to give everything,

to illustrate the two Pauline appearances to the Apostles by the two in John, or the two Pauline ones by the one of the earlier Gospels. Without doubt the latter have the farewell character in common; but the main point must be questioned or even denied, namely, that the farewell took place according to arrangement on a hill which is depicted more or less as a Mount of Ascension, which Jesus did not require, and that it was accompanied by solemn words of farewell which Jesus did not utter.¹ In a word, the two appearances to the Apostles in John agree with Paul's only in number; the details are late and are contradicted by the ancient Gospels, although the narrative is constructed out of them.

v From what is tangible in the appearances, we turn back now to the darker mystery of the resurrection itself, as to which Paul offers us little, and the Gospels much. Before the first vision of Peter, Paul has only the few words: "Buried, and raised again on the third day, according to the Scriptures."² He relates in these words, not merely his view and his conviction—perhaps essentially based on the Old Testament—but also the tradition of the Apostles and of Peter, to which he owed the general fact of the resurrection and most probably also its occurrence on the third day, both perhaps quite independently of the predictions of the Old Testament, as to which predictions Paul might afterwards have satisfied himself.³ In fact, the other sources in the New Testament—Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, to some extent the weighty Revelation of John—speak loudly of the resurrection on the third day: ought it not to be permitted to complete and illustrate this harmonious report by the testimony of all the Gospels to the fact that on the third day the Galilean women

¹ The five hundred have often been connected with the meeting in Matt. xxviii. 16. But only Apostles were there. On the other hand, also Steinm. p. 152.

² 1 Cor. xv. 4.

³ See 1 Cor. xv. 4 in relation to verse 3, and then the unanimous tradition of the Gospels of the resurrection on the third day, which Paul's statement as to the third day also represents as a tradition, and not merely as his inference from the Old Testament.

formally established the emptiness of the grave of Jesus?¹ It certainly appears most probable that the faithful women, the sole mourning visitors at the cross and the burial, paid a fresh pilgrimage to the grave when the Sabbath was over; that with astonishment and terror they found the stone rolled away and the grave empty; that they hastened to Jerusalem, or better—to which Matthew and Mark still in part point—to Galilee, to carry this news to Peter and the twelve; and that what they had seen was then explained and confirmed by the sudden appearances of the resuscitated Lord before the eyes of the Apostles. This is altogether independent of the questions whether the grave had been emptied by resurrection or by an unexplained accident, whether the one who appeared was the risen or the actual Jesus, or perhaps only an ocular illusion consequent upon the report of the women. It is simply the discovery of the empty grave which is here discussed; and this appears so probable that many critics, not only of the Right but even of the Left, are able to regard it as certain and incontrovertible.² Yet if we look more closely, we shall be more suspicious. Nowhere is Gospel myth more contradictory and more untenable than just upon this decisive point. We have already spoken of the great contradictions in the Gospels with reference to the grave of Jesus; and how can we build authentic history upon these contradictions, upon these discrepancies as to the day and the time of day, the persons at the grave and the object of their

¹ Comp. the predictions of Jesus, Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19, also xii. 40 and xxvii. 63 sq.; then the fact, xxviii. 1, comp. Luke xxiv. 1, 7, 46; Mark xvi. 1; John ii. 19 sqq.; Acts x. 40. Also Rev. xi. 11, where mention is in the first place made of the three and a half days of the state of death of the two Christian prophets, on the ground of the Old Testament apocalyptic unfortunatè number ($3\frac{1}{2}$ years), but where the whole representation seeks to repeat the glorification of Jesus after the three days.—The attestation of the empty condition of the grave by the women, Matt. xxviii. 1 sqq., and par. passages.

² Even Schenkel, p. 321 (*Bib.-Lex.* I. pp. 294 sqq.): incontrovertible. Similarly Schleierm., Hase, Holtzm., Weizs.; as also Bayschlag, Gebhardt, Godet, Güder, Heer, Krabbe, Krauss, Paul, Riggenb., Steinm., and others. Sceptical, Strauss, II. 4th ed. pp. 638 sq., Weisse, Holsten, Scholten. Weisse (p. 344) assumes that the notion of the material emptiness of the grave was first occasioned by the rumour of the theft of the body.

going thither, upon the unhistorical assumption of the presence of the Apostles at Jerusalem or indeed at the grave, upon the so conspicuous and yet so completely mythical angelic phenomena at the grave, with their contradictory figures and sayings, with their impossible actions and words?¹ Since this mythical picture is completely destroyed, since Paul—despite his intention to give a most detailed account—is quite silent about the facts and scenes at the grave which would constitute a most important point in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, and since in the Epistle to the Corinthians he evidently denies the presence of men, and in the Epistle to the Romans the agency of angels, it is palpable that the accounts of the resurrection, of the discovery of the empty grave, are only ingenious but arbitrary explanations and portrayals of what from the Jewish standpoint would be regarded as the necessary precursor and foundation of the—only real—appearances in Galilee.²

On the other hand, it is now objected by a hundred voices, that from the Jewish standpoint belief in Jesus's resuscitation would have been impossible if the grave had not been found empty, if Joseph of Arimathæa and the other believers at Jerusalem, as well as the unbelieving Jews, had been able to prove the presence of the corpse in the grave.³ But if it was necessary to the completion of the plastic conception which the Jews and Paul had of the resuscitation of a dead person, that they should think of the body of the dead as passing in a grosser or a subtler form out of the grave—which Holsten and Scholten very unjustly deny—yet their persuasion of the reality of the resuscitation by no means depended upon a kind of modern critical police inquiry as to the factual emptiness of the grave, but merely upon the

¹ Schleierm. *L. J.* p. 469: in an historical time such as this was, the appearance of angels is an anachronism. Comp. also Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 587 sqq.

² 1 Cor. xv. 4 sq.; Rom. i. 4.

³ Most of the above-mentioned hold the fact of the empty grave to be very important. The discovery, the judicial proof, of the presence of the corpse in the grave would have refuted everything; thus in particular Beyschlag, Gebhardt, Güder, Heer, Krabbe, Krauss, Paul, and, long before them, Friedrich in *Eichh. Bibl.* VII, p. 223, as well as Paulus.

conviction, by means of his appearance, of the actual living of the one who was dead.¹ Did it occur to the acute and anxious tetrarch Antipas to establish, or to calm his fears by disproving, the resurrection of the Baptist, of which his conscience dreamt, by an examination of his grave?² Still less could it have occurred to the Apostles and believers who were made happy by the living appearance of Jesus, distrustfully to examine his grave, or—since they were in Galilee where the grave was not—to make a journey of inspection to Jerusalem.³ Finally, we have no reason to think that the Jews of Jerusalem were more acute and calculating than Antipas; they were not so nearly interested in the question as he had been, and the news of the disciples' belief in the resurrection would not reach them until late. When it did reach them, they would content themselves with a determined or a half-hearted denial of the belief; and they would be the more likely to forego an examination of the grave because—quite irrespective of the prohibition to remove the *golal* from a grave—they would most carefully avoid the impurity of the dead and the grave. Moreover, the inspection of a body in advanced decay must have appeared not only disagreeable but also futile, since according to Jewish opinion it was no longer possible to identify a dead body after the third day.⁴

Therefore, so much remains historical: the appearances were seen and they were explained by resurrection; afterwards, in order to satisfy Jewish belief and thought, and to meet Jewish mistrust and calumny, as objective and materialistic a colouring

¹ Holsten, pp. 128 sqq.; Scholten, *Joh.* pp. 321 sqq., *Aelt. Ev.* pp. 225 sqq.

² Matt. xiv. 1 sq., comp. Acts xxiii. 6, 9. Will any one find a proof in Gen. v. 24 (*οὐχ ἐπίσκερο*), Deut. xxxiv. 6, and 2 Kings ii. 12, 17?

³ Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 638, lays stress upon the absence in Galilee, where contradiction was not possible.

⁴ Ceremonial impurity, Num. xix. 11; Matt. xxiii. 27, comp. above, V. p. 214. Also *Hier. Mæd. Kathon*, f. 82, col. 2: *anima per triduum corpus circumvolat animo revertendi; post hæc conspiciens immutatum vultum avolat.* Maimon. *Gerush.* c. ult.: *si triduo elapso mortuum conspiciamus, dignoscere cum licet; post hæc immutatur ejus facies.* Lightfoot, p. 43.

was given to the resurrection as was possible under the circumstances, with the special aid of the Galilean women, who were the last to remain faithful. It is also an historical fact that the first appearance did not occur in Galilee before the third day, though, on the other hand, it was not long after that day.¹ The latter has already been made evident; the former is self-evident. For though the belief in the resurrection on the third day is based partly upon foreign, as we shall see upon dogmatic, grounds, yet, since the Apostles themselves, as Paul shows, confessed to this belief, it was not possible for them to date the resurrection later than the appearances of the risen Lord. Perhaps the first appearance occurred on the third day itself, on the Sunday, or indeed on the evening of the Saturday, when the fugitive Peter had reached home or was on the way thither.² But whether it occurred thus or differently, that is somewhat later, a resuscitation after a few days must have been assumed, at the latest at the close of the third day, because of the Jewish period of the entry of the soul in the nether-world. And, finally, the third day would be found to be significantly supported by a well-known though misunderstood prediction of Jesus which was again called to mind, as well as by the Old Testament, by the prophet Hosea, who speaks enigmatically of a reviving after two days and on the third day, and by the notorious fate of the prophet Jonah, used by Jesus himself as a prototype, and whose fate the editor of Matthew applies to Jesus, indeed places in

¹ Note the different expressions in the sources: 1 Cor. xv. 4, on the third day; similarly Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19, and Luke throughout from ix. 22 to Acts x. 40. On the contrary, Rev. xi. 11: after three days; so throughout (against Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 103, note 4), Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34; also Matt. in one passage which belongs to the editor, xxvii. 63, comp. xii. 40. John ii. 19: in three days. The difference is due to the fact that Paul, Matt., and Luke, reproduce exactly the passage in Hosea vi. 2 (see below); and therefore Mark is to be regarded not exactly, with Ewald, as the most original, nor exactly, with Volkmar, as the follower of the Revelation; see Hosea vi. 2 (*μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας*), comp. Jonah i. 17, Matt. xii. 40.

² Thus Holsten fixed the appearance to Peter on the third day. Interesting, nevertheless, is the fact of the three days' journey between Jerusalem and Galilee, of which Krabbe and Volkmar do not think (above, p. 285, n. 1).

Jesus's mouth.¹ Thus was first formed the conception, held by Matthew among the Evangelists, that Jesus lay in the grave only through the Sabbath, and that he rose again on the evening of the Sabbath, therefore at the time of transition to the first day of the week.² But, as the other sources show, this assumption was soon made to give way to the fresh conception that he effected his victory at the dawn of the first day of the week, with the first rays of the sun on Sunday morning. Beautiful as was the idea that Jesus spent in the grave merely the Sabbatic rest commanded by God himself, nay, observed by Him in the creation, it was nevertheless obnoxious to the objection that from Friday to Saturday evening three days could be reckoned only by the strictest Jewish mode of reckoning, and not by the popular computation of natural days. Further, the Christian Sunday commended itself in preference to the Jewish Sabbath, and particularly the day in preference to the night, as an eloquent symbol and as a means of dispelling doubt and mistrust, incidentally as the possible and appropriate time for embalming, the intention of doing which is said by the later sources to have led the women to the grave. Hence it is now said that Jesus was in the grave on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, but that as soon as possible, with the passing away of the night, with the first sunlight of Sunday, he burst the bonds of death.³

¹ The Jewish belief, Acts ii. 24, and above, p. 229, n. 4. The words of Jesus, above, IV. pp. 13, 123. The two prophetic passages, Hosea vi. 2, Jonah i. 17 (comp. Matt. xii. 39 sqq., although verse 40 is no saying of Jesus's). Lact. 4, 19, thought of Hosea.

² Matt. xxviii. 1 (see below, p. 303). Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 640, finds the Sabbath rest in the Gospels generally, but singularly enough not in the text of Matt. The supposition may suggest itself that Matt. was led by Hosea vi. 2 to fix the resurrection on the second day and the ascension on the third. But xxviii. 7 points to the fifth or the sixth.

³ Luke xxiv. 1; Mark xvi. 1; John xx. 1. Hence Barnabas, c. 15, Justin, *Ap.* 1, 67, have Sunday. Barnabas gives new and original symbolism. Also Apollon. of Tyana found release in the night objectionable, 8, 30.

2.—*The Resurrection Myths.*

When in garden and vineyard we have vigorously and resolutely cut away the luxuriant growth of climbing plants which stopped the path and obscured the view, there is nothing to prevent us from leaving them where they lie and passing on. But here the case is a little different. These tangled myths of the history of the resurrection have in them so much that is dangerous as well as so much that is beautiful, that we may afford a moment to stand still and to study their elaborate organisms, and also to strengthen the conviction that we have done right in cutting them down.

These myths have, like others, above all the aim of glorifying Jesus: hence there are angels and earthquakes, Jesus passes through closed doors, appears and disappears despite his otherwise evident corporeity, and finally ascends in the clouds from earth to heaven. But they have also an economic interest. They aim at making as evident and convincing as possible the fact that is controverted by unbelief and littleness of faith.¹ They produce earlier and earlier, and more and more numerous, witnesses, even outside of the circle of the Apostles, among the representatives of the later Christian Church, but never trespassing against consistency by finding these witnesses among the Jewish and Gentile opponents. They show the forsaken grave and its inventory, grave seal and grave watch and the ludicrous lie of the enemy; the indisputable reality of the new body of Jesus, who does not act as a "spirit," but can eat, drink, speak, show his wounds, sit with and walk with them as formerly—marks of corporeity which, indeed, to other than Oriental logic do not very well harmonize with Jesus' glorification.² Finally,

¹ Unbelief, Matt. xxvii. 62 sq. Weak faith, Matt. xxviii. 17; Luke xxiv. 37; Acts i. 3. Compare the general Gentile-Christian unbelief as to the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 12. Comp. Acts i. 3: by many evidences he proved himself to be living, x. 40 sq.

² No revelation for the people and his opponents, Acts x. 40 sq. The editor of Matthew, in his account of the experience of the guard at the grave, does not once allow them to see the Lord, xxviii. 4.

special gains for the life of faith are wrung from the resurrection. To the general strengthening of Christian faith with its perspective of future triumphs, come the instructions, commissions, consolations, which prepared the disciples for their apostolic career, for the apostolic age, and Christians generally for the earnestness and the aims of their life upon earth. We need not relate all this in detail, but we will glance at the course of development from story to story, from author to author.

The ancient Matthew begins the series. After six o'clock on the Sabbath evening, when the stars are beginning to glimmer, he shows two women, Mary of Magdala and Mary the mother of the younger James, on their way to the grave.¹ They are now

¹ This is the place to introduce the explanation of the chronology in Matt. xxviii. 1 --an explanation very different from any that is usually made. Who has not been struck by this remarkable statement of the time, the first half of which appears to indicate an evening and the second half a morning? But help is at hand, which affords a proof of the antiquity of the Gospel, against all sophisms past and to come. In the first place, every explanation is arbitrary which does not, with Origen, Eus., Ital., Vulg., Aug., understand $\delta\psi\epsilon\ \sigma\alpha\beta\beta$. in the sense of *vespere sabbati*, on the evening of the Sabbath; since $\delta\psi\epsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ is very usual among the Greeks (Thuc. 4, 93; Xen. *H. Gr.* 2, 1, 22), and in the N. T. the absolute $\delta\psi\epsilon$ and $\delta\psi\iota\alpha\varsigma$, like the Heb. *ereb*, stand in the sense of the natural evening (Matt. xxvii. 57, comp. viii. 16, xiv. 15, &c.). But if this is not allowed to mean anything except evening (comp. Lightfoot, p. 389), then $\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\sigma\kappa$. cannot indicate the morning of the following day, since the two phrases must not exclude one another. Meyer thinks that the evening as midnight "reached its hand to the dawn," which is contrary to the conception of $\delta\psi\iota\alpha$, contrary to the current mode of dividing the day (according to which the night following the Sabbath did not belong to the Sabbath after six o'clock, reckoning strictly, or under any circumstances after twelve o'clock, but to the first week-day after the Sabbath, comp. Bleek, II. p. 494), and, finally, contrary to the plain facts of the case, as the women would not be able to inspect the grave at or a little after midnight, Matt. xxviii. 1. But now upon $\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\sigma\kappa$, which is evidently already misunderstood by Luke xxiv. 1, Mark xvi. 2 (sunrise), a light suddenly shines. Luke xxiii. 54, $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta$. $\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ incontrovertibly shows that this expression was used not merely for the dawn of the natural day (comp. 2 Sam. ii. 32), but also for the commencement of the civil day, which began at six o'clock in the evening (with the appearance of the stars or the lighting of lights); it was used, therefore, *e.g.*, of the commencement of the Sabbath on the evening of Friday. This observation is copiously confirmed by the Talmudic and Aramaic phraseology, according to which, *or*, *orta*, *urta* (Buxt. p. 44), and *nehar*, *nehor* (*ib.* pp. 1311 sq., comp. Job iii. 4), *i.e.* light and lighting, stand for the commencement of the day in the evening. Hence *Gloss. Cherit.* f. 79, 2: *luce octogesimi primi est nocte octog. primi*. See Lightfoot on Luke, *l.c.* p. 565. Mich. *Lex. Syr.* p. 538. Gesen. in Rosenmüller's *Rep.* I. p. 132. De Wette on Matt. xxviii. 1. It belongs to the peculiarities of harmonistic exegesis, that this only possible meaning (which seems also

doing what the Sabbatic rest had forbidden, they are visiting their dead Lord. With alarm they see the stone removed, and an angel, bright as the lightning and with garments white as snow, sitting upon it. The angel calms them: Jesus is risen as he had predicted; they are to look at the place where he had lain, to hasten to inform the disciples, and to direct them to Galilee, whither Jesus had already gone. Then follows the solemn Galilean farewell, which we will examine when we are considering the ascension.¹ Mark diverges but a little from Matthew. According to Mark, on the evening of the Sabbath the women, to whom is added Salome the mother of the sons of Zebedee, have previously purchased sweet spices with which to anoint the body, and on the morning of Sunday, after sunrise yet (with Luke) very early—but not as early as three o'clock, as an old Latin translation gives it—they go to the grave, being trou-

to be corroborated by Matt. xxviii. 13), has been without exception completely kept out of sight by respect for the statements of the other Gospels (only *Acta Pil.* 13, 14, has *μέσης νυκτός*, media nocte). The collateral appeal to Matthew himself, who everywhere reads *τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, is ridiculous, because from Friday 4—6 p.m. until Saturday after 6 p.m. could be likewise reckoned as three days. The difficulty of the passage in Matthew and what appeared to be its natural meaning has been often perceived, from Origen and Eusebins down to Kypke and Paulus, De Wette, Wieseler, and Bleek. But all, including Fritzsche on the passage, Kern (*Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1834, p. 102), Strauss (4th ed. II. p. 571), Bleek (II. p. 494), Wieseler (*Chron. Syn.* p. 425), Ewald (3rd ed. VI. p. 81, n. 3), De Wette and Meyer, Caspari (pp. 205 sq.), finally also Volkmar (p. 627)—this time not without that “astonishment” at Matthew which he repeats after Baur, who used it of Mark—all treat the passage harmonistically, naturally with endless text torturings. In this Paulus takes precedence, for he attaches *ὁψὲ δὲ σαββ.* to xxvii. 66, and places a point after it (III. 2, p. 854). The others bring their healing skill to bear upon the *ὁψὲ σαββ.* (1) It means: after the end of the week (Grotius, Wies., Meyer, 2nd ed.), an explanation which maltreats both *ὁψὲ* and *σαββατα*. (2) It means: after the Sabbath (thus Lightfoot, De Wette, Bleek, Grimm), as if *ὁψὲ* ever undertook the work of *μετὰ*, as if there was not a specific meaning in the passages—cited from the times of Lightfoot (p. 759) and Paulus—Philostratus, *V. Apoll.* 4, 18 (*ὁψὲ μυστηρίων*), and Plut. *V. Num.* 1: *ὁψὲ τῶν βασιλέως χοόνων*. (3) It means indeed *vespere sabbati*, but “far in the night,” towards day-break (Meyer, 4th ed.)! That Meyer was compelled to rush from one explanation to another and to reject the other explanations, and that Bleek again rejected his, is a proof that exegesis with its artifices was going fundamentally astray. But it was reserved for Weiss to explain the original expression out of Mark xvi. 1 sq.! *Mark.-Ev.* 1872, p. 570.

¹ Matt. xxviii. 1—3, 5—8, 16—20. The critical detection of the added passages, see below, p. 308.

bled in mind as they go about the great stone which threatens to hinder their labour of love.¹ There they see the very great stone removed; and on entering the grave they now perceive an angel, having the appearance of a young man, sitting on the right robed in a white raiment. From this point Mark agrees literally with Matthew, except that of the disciples Peter in particular is to be informed, and then is described the flight of the women, who are too much alarmed to tell what they have seen to any whom they meet. Here the Gospel in its genuine form ends; doubtless the lost conclusion contained the announcement to the disciples and the Galilean farewell.²

Luke's narrative is quite different; but it is not, as Griesbach very erroneously thought, based on the account in John.³ The introduction is, however, like that in Mark. The women go at dawn on Sunday for the purpose of embalming. Their little company is grown bigger; and instead of Salome, Joanna is expressly mentioned.⁴ The stone gives them no trouble—here Luke, like Matthew, is simpler than Mark—they find it rolled away. In the grave they first perceive the absence of the corpse; then in their trouble come two angels as comforters and in part as censors: they ought not to seek the living among the dead; they should remember his predictions in Galilee, which, when repeated, the women recognize, and, at first bowing their heads in affright, hasten with the glad tidings—though they have received no invitation to the Galilean reunion—to the Apostles and all the faithful. Their story is not believed.⁵ Peter, alone or—as it was somewhat later reported—accompanied by several others, hastens to the grave, but sees nothing except the linen bands.⁶ Yet the emptiness of the grave is thereby proved afresh,

¹ To roll away the stone (also from springs), Gen. xxix. 8. The definition of the time, Mark xvi. 1, is—as is often the case in other passages—midway between Matt. (light) and Luke (darkness). Salome, questioned by Scholten, p. 167.

² Mark xvi. 1—8. The critical question as to verses 9—20, see below, p. 318.

³ Luke xxiv. 1 sqq. ⁴ Luke xxiii. 55, xxiv. 10, 22. ⁵ Luke xxiv. 9 sqq., 22 sqq.

⁶ I cannot strike out Luke xxiv. 12, notwithstanding Griesb., Schulz, Rinck, Scholten, Lachm., Tisch., Ewald; therein I agree with Bleek, De Wette, Meyer. Against

and Peter is prepared for greater things, such as happen on the very same day. After midday—thus runs the beautiful though so feebly attested Emmaus legend, a legend more easily translated than any other from the material into the spiritual, the mental—two adherents of Jesus, one of them being Clopas, perhaps the father of the younger James, are walking to the village of Chammat or Emmaus (“Hot Spring”), two or three leagues from Jerusalem.¹ They speak of the event of which their hearts are full.

D and Syr. Hier., there is the authority of the most important codices, whilst It. varies; the verse is not only assumed by Eusebius (despite the inferences drawn by Tisch. from Eus. *Can.*), but it is also required by xxiv. 24, since Luke in this part of his Gospel goes into detail, and the similarity to John xx. 2—10 can be as well explained as the omission of the verse out of respect for John. Luke is evidently simpler than John, and there is nothing in the alleged use of John by Luke (which Meyer transforms into the use of a source of Johannine tradition). The so-called Johannine *ὁθόνια* has its parallels, not in Luke xxiii. 53, but in Acts x. 11, xi. 5. *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν* is, according to logic (leading idea) and linguistic usage (Luke xviii. 11; comp. Mark xiv. 4), to be construed with *θανυμάζων*, and not with *ἀπὸ ἑλθε*, as John thought it well to do (thus already Vulg. *secum mirans*, against Euthym. and moderns); and *παρακύψας* is otherwise in the New Test. not more peculiar to John than to Luke, because it stands twice in John xx. 5, 11, the second time being a reminiscence of the first borrowing from Luke. Finally, it readily suggests itself that objection was taken to the verse, not because it contradicted verse 24 (De Wette, Meyer), but rather because it contradicted verse 34 (which verse 24, that has been allowed to remain, does not) or John. On the other hand, it is plain that a later interpolator of verse 24, who built upon John, would not have named Peter alone, in contradiction to John, but the *ἄλλος μαθ.* also.

¹ Steinm. p. 172: no mere poetry, not a single suspicious feature; second preparation of the Apostles.—All the Apostles, including Luke, have since Origen, Epiph., Theoph., in turn been wayfarers to Emmaus. Lightfoot: Peter. Lange: Luke. According to Volkmar, the Pauline writer wished to put Peter in the background! There has been a good deal of brain-puzzling about Emmaus. Luke places this Emmaus 60 stadia from Jerusalem (preponderant testimony, confirmed also by Luke xxiv. 33, see Tisch. *opp.* 160, remarkably supported, much to the satisfaction of Robinson, by Sinait. among others). It is therefore not Chammat or *κόμη Ἀμμαούς* (Joshua xix. 3^o; Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 3), near Tiberius; nor is it the city Emmaus (Ammaus, comp. Rabb. in Lightfoot, p. 479) or (with altered name since A.D. 223, Jul. Africanus having rebuilt it) Nicopolis, 160—170 stadia, seven leagues, W.N.W. of Jerusalem, half-way to Jaffa, and now called Amwās (for this Eus. (Hier.) *Onom.* 186 sq.; Sozom., William of Tyre, Lightfoot, Ritter, Robinson, Rödiger, Arnold). Among those who would distinguish it from Nicopolis are Reland, Wetstein, wherein these are followed by De Wette, Meyer, Bleek. On the other hand, Jos. *B. J.* 7, 6, 6, offers a tangible point in the mention of a *χωρίον Ἀμμαούς*, 60 stadia from Jerusalem, which Vespasian, after the destruction of the Holy City, converted into a colony by making it the residence of eight hundred veterans. This may be the place, only it is difficult to point it out; indeed, Beza (Lightfoot, p. 476), Ewald, Grimm, read in Josephus 30 instead of

Then Jesus, whom they do not recognize, joins them as a third wayfarer, and inquires as to their sorrow, which they relate, and at the close they repeat the incredible story of the empty grave vouched for by the women and by others. Then the wayfarer turns teacher and judge; he censures their unbelief with regard to the prophets, and shows, from Moses down to the prophets, that Christ must thus proceed from suffering to glorification. Still they do not recognize him; but they compel him to enter the village with them because it is evening, and when he blesses and breaks the bread, they discover the Lord.¹ He now vanishes; but they, reproaching themselves for not recognizing him towards whom their warm burning heart, the *Chammat* ("Hot Spring") within them, yearned as he spoke, hasten at once back to Jerusalem, where in the assembly of all the disciples they are met with the confirmatory cry, "The Lord is truly risen, and has appeared unto Simon."² Thus there are many witnesses of the empty grave, and three witnesses to Jesus's being alive. Again, whilst the Emmaus pilgrims are relating their story, he comes himself into the great assembly. They are alarmed, they fear a spirit. But he is no spirit. O marvel! he shows his pierced hands and feet and allows them to be touched; and he com-

60 stadia. It may be, however, as Rödiger thought possible, that Josephus has been corrected in favour of Luke by Christian transcribers, and that therefore the passage originally read 30 stadia. And this distance best corresponds with the present Kulonieh (Colonia), about a league and a quarter W.N.W. of Jerusalem (thus Sepp, Ewald, Caspari, p. 207). More remote would be the Culondia (which has not yet been adduced), described by Van de Velde as two leagues N. of Jerusalem; as would also be El Kubeibeh, often mentioned from the fourteenth century down to the present time, and which is above two leagues N.W. of Jerusalem (Pocock, Rosenm., Michaelis, recently in particular Dr. Herm. Zschokke, *Das neutest. Emmaus*, 1865, with appendix of exact measurements by the engineer Konrad Schick, who found the distance of the three existing roads 62—65 stadia). El Kubeibeh as Emmaus would be a very desirable discovery to the Franciscan station there; but, to say nothing of the distance, the connection of the word with Colonia is more than doubtful.

¹ Towards the close of the day, Hebr. *nathah*, Judges xix. 8; *jarad*, verse 11.

² Burning heart, Luke xxiv. 32; comp. Jer. xx. 9. It may be admitted as possible that the name of the place *Chammat* itself ingeniously represents this inner fire. For *chamam* (comp. *cham*, *chamma*) is "to be warm," and Jos. *Ant.* 18, 2, 3, speaks of Emmaus near Tiberias as *θερμα*. These hot springs are still there. Comp. also Rabb. in Lightfoot, p. 479. Foolish derivation in Caspari, p. 207.

pletely overcomes the unbelief of those present by asking for meat, by eating a piece of fish and honeycomb, and—according to the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, here and elsewhere—by drinking wine.¹ Then follows the farewell, which the Acts of the Apostles also relates, but differently.

Now appears the editor of Matthew. In his days the false story of the Jews, that the disciples had stolen the body, has already got into circulation. He therefore places a guard at, and attaches a seal to, the grave. The more contemptible the lie of the opponents, the more imposingly and the more certainly must the resurrection be now represented.² When the women come to the grave, a great earthquake happens, an angel descends from heaven and rolls the stone away—at which, in view of the powerlessness of the Son of God, Celsus mocks.³ The guards, though perceiving only the earthquake and the angel, are alarmed and become as dead men, whilst the women are gladdened, not merely by the comforting words of the angel, but lo! a moment afterwards by the presence of Jesus, who, however, simply repeats the commission given by the angel.⁴ On the other hand, Jerusalem can defend itself only with lies and bribery. Several of the guards go to the high-priests and make known what has occurred. A council is hurriedly called, and, for the second time since the treachery of Judas, recourse is had to bribery: the soldiers must report that the disciples have stolen the corpse while the guards slept.⁵ Certainly this naivest of all stories

¹ On Luke xxiv. 41 sqq., comp. Acts (not i. 4, συναλιζ., even in Meyer, Overb.; but) x. 41, and, below, the Gospel of the Hebrews.

² Matt. xxvii. 64, xxviii. 15. Acts xxiii. 9 (comp. ii.—v.) has nothing thereon. The term "Jews" (above, I. p. 85) very commonly used by Josephus, *Vita*, 76, &c. Tertullian, *Ap.* 21: nullis apparentibus discipulis.

³ Origen, *Con. Cels.* 5, 52. *Lact.* 4, 19. In the time of the latter, belief had outgrown Matthew (Quenstedt, *System*, II. p. 634), and Jesus is made to rise clauso sepulcro. Passed current until recently, Hase, p. 276.

⁴ Comp. Rev. xi. 11.

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 2—15. Though criticism has long since disposed of the guard at the grave (above, p. 270), and the supposition of a later interpolation of it has been advocated mainly by Hilgenfeld and also by Holsten, yet the full extent of this interpolation has not been recognized. It is easy to suppose that the interpolater of xxvii.

has less to stand upon than almost any other. Roman soldiers would not have left their posts, would not have told the Jews first, would not have looked upon their nocturnal sleep as legitimate; and, like Agrippa's guards of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, they would—despite the protection of the Jews which is here very artlessly brought into view—have had their nocturnal sleep prolonged by the reward of capital punishment from the procurator thus ignominiously circumvented by soldiers and high-priests, but who in his despatch to the emperor Claudius treats the subject without any exhibition of strong feeling.¹

The police proceedings at the grave were superfluous to the later writers with their day-light resurrection, especially to

62—66, xxviii. 11—15, has also not left the intermediate section, xxviii. 1—10, unaltered. Here (1) xxviii. 4 is certainly an interpolation which disturbs and interrupts the conversation between the angel and the women, introduces the guards of the grave, and transfers to them, probably in an exaggerated form, the fear of the women which, though not described, is yet assumed in verse 5. (2) Verses 9 and 10 are an interpolation, since an appearance of Jesus merely for the purpose of repeating the commission of the angel is—notwithstanding Meyer, who finds it appropriate and necessary (also Steinm. p. 66)—meaningless and undignified, and verse 8 has its natural continuation in verse 16. Indeed, there are grounds for the opinion that verses 9 sq. are the addition of a still later interpolater, since verse 11 much more readily connects itself with verse 8, whilst 9 sq. make a break in the context. (3) It is easy to assume that even the description of the resurrection in verse 2 belongs to the author of verse 4, its aim being to explain the awaking of the guards in alarm. These observations are very strongly supported by a comparison with the later Gospels, Luke and Mark, in which all these passages, the description of the physical agency in the resurrection and of the impression produced upon the guards, indeed the guards themselves, and finally the actual appearance of Jesus to the women, are entirely wanting (comp. Mark xvi. 8, where, despite the abrupt style of the Gospel, it may with certainty be said that another appearance of Jesus cannot be forced in: οὐδενὶ οὐδέν ἐῖπον). The first to use the edited form of Matt. is John xx. 14—17.

¹ Comp. Acts xii. 19. Also above, p. 151. *Acta Pil.* B. 13 gives prominence to the difficulty as to Pilate, whilst in the Latin version 13 (29), comp. *Acta Petr. et Paul.* c. 40 (ep. ad Claud.), Pilate shows himself undisturbed. The soldiers say: φοβούμεθα, μὴ πως ἀκούσῃ ὁ Παῦλος, ὅτι ἐλάβομεν ἡμεῖς ἀργύρια κ. φονεύσει ἡμᾶς. Then the Jews become sureties for the explanation. The story found formerly in Krabbe (p. 411) a valiant defender (the Pharisees believed in the resurrection, therefore bribery is conceivable); and now Steinm. *Leidensgesch.* 1868, p. 251, says that the soldiers reported to the Jewish authorities who abetted them; bribery and lying are conceivable from John viii. 44, and from the analogy of modern criticism, the sophisms of which are still worse.

John, the Evangelist of Christian mysticism. Yet he has not neglected the proof of Jesus's being alive: he borrows from Matthew Magdalene's visit to the grave and the message to the disciples; from the editor of Matthew, the appearance of Jesus to Magdalene; from Mark, the angel or angels sitting in the grave; from Luke—here his favourite late source—Peter's visit to the grave, the blindness and the clear-sightedness of the Emmaus disciples who live again in Magdalene, and finally the sudden presence of Jesus in the midst of the Apostles on the evening of Sunday, when he shows the marks of the nails.¹ There are added, from old and new sources, many subtle characteristics, and at the close, in the conviction of Thomas, Luke is utilized afresh.² To give the details, his narrative is as follows: At dawn on Sunday, Mary of Magdala comes alone to visit the grave that had held the corpse which on Friday received from Nicodemus and Joseph the last honours of the sweet spices. The Galilean women—incidentally, however, revealing themselves—are here condensed into one figure, in which the distress and the sorrow and the glowing love of the community of Jesus are embodied.³ With the at first purely painful news of the rolled-away stone, of the taken-away corpse of the Lord, she goes to Peter, and to John the once more artfully introduced rival of Peter, whom he now and for ever robs of his right of first-born as to the vision of the risen Lord. Each strives to get first to the grave; the ardent love of John has the advantage; he stoops into the grave and discovers the linen bands. Peter then enjoys the privilege of being the first to enter the grave, and he finds a remarkable new sign, the head-napkin, neatly folded and laid aside by itself. This was an evidence to faith that no violence, no stormy onset, had here taken place, that the Lord himself had in quiet and in peace removed one wrapping

¹ John xx. 1, 17; comp. Matt. xxviii. 1, 7. John xx. 14 sqq. and Matt. xxviii. 9. Farther, John xx. 2 sqq. and Luke xxiv. 11 sq. John xx. 14—16 and Luke xxiv. 16 sqq. John xx. 19 sqq. and Luke xxiv. 36 sqq.

² John xx. 24 sq., 27, and Luke xxiv. 33 sq., 39.

³ John xx. 1, comp. 2 (13).

after another. This glance of faith, the third, the glance of victory, was reserved for the now following John; indeed, this spiritual faith put to the blush that material Christophany of Peter which Luke narrated only a moment afterwards, and which Paul and Luke exclusively boast of, whilst the fourth Gospel disparages it both by silence and by words. The work of faith is repeated in a higher form—namely, by means of the spectacle of Jesus itself—in Magdalene, a new heiress of the position of Peter. Whilst the disciples go away, she tarries at the grave, stands there lost in meditation, without inquisitively examining, and weeps. At last she also stoops into the grave, and though until now only the witness of the empty grave without angels, without Jesus, who according to the other sources had early appeared to the women of Galilee, she now experiences one glory after another. In the place where Jesus had lain there sit two angels, one at the head and the other at the feet, and they ask why she weeps. Without being alarmed by the presence of the angels, she confesses her distress because the Lord has been taken away. At the same moment she looks back, and Jesus stands before her. She does not know him, takes him to be the *gannan*, the gardener, and asks him what he has done with the corpse.¹ Then the cry “Mary!” penetrating through her ear to her heart, like the blessing of bread in the case of the Emmaus disciples, like the “Peace” cry in the case of the Apostles, solves the enigma of the appearance and of her soul. “Rabboni, my Lord!”² is her response; she is about to

¹ John xx. 11—15. Gardener of the vineyard, of the olive-garden, *gannan*, also *ginnai* or *aris(a)*, Buxt. pp. 226, 459.

² *Rabboni*, the best-attested reading in both Mark x. 51 and John xx. 16; *Rabboni* in Mark St. Gall., and in John Ephr., and in both places It., Vulg. The latter form is the correct one: *ri(a)bbon* (comp. *rabbi* and *ribbi*) is, in later Hebrew, “The lord” (*Der Herr*), and is very frequently used of God and other lords, *ribboni*, *i. e.* “My lord!” Buxt. pp. 2178 sq. Hence the derivation from *rabban*, with a Galilean obscuration of the vowel (Grimm), is not to be assumed, especially as *rabban* without this suffix is usual. On this title, Lightfoot, p. 357; above, III. p. 15, V. pp. 61, 206. For the nun berless explanations of the well-known *μή μου ἄπρον*, John xx. 17, the Gospel itself is partly responsible because of the indefiniteness of its language; the responsibility belongs partly to the caprice of expositors. The explanation must be

take hold of him, but he prevents her because he is in haste to take his departure, and sends her to the twelve as the announcer of his speedily-to-be-accomplished ascension to the common Father. From heaven he next appears to the disciples on that Sunday evening at Jerusalem which Luke had already described.¹ How remarkably does he unite the divine and the human: he enters through the closed doors by which the disciples protected themselves from the Jews, and yet he shows his hands, and his side that had been pierced by the spear.² The disciples are easily convinced, and their joy is great. Unbelief is not, however, completely broken down; but it must be broken down. Thomas

based (1) upon the word itself, (2) upon the explication which follows. As to the word itself, we find it used in the following senses: touch me not believingly, Matt. ix. 20; not lovingly, Prov. vi. 29, 1 Cor. vii. 1; not doubting, Luke xxiv. 40, John xx. 25; not in a way to cause pain or injury, Gen. xxvi. 11; not so as to impede, comp. Luke viii. 45; not so as to make me or thee unclean, 2 Cor. vi. 17, Col. ii. 21. Thus Lücke, Maier, Ewald, Press., Strauss, Hilg., Volkmar, have spoken of deprecation of faith, nay, of worship (Rev. xxii. 8); Chrysos., Theod. Mops., Theophyl., Euth., Erasmus, Jansen, of the warding off of unbecoming obtrusiveness; Luther, Melan., Grotius, Neander, De Wette, Tholuck, Luth., Baumg., Bleek, Hase, Lange, of the warding off of passionate or pleasurable contact; Baumg.-Crusius, Meyer, Grimm, Baüml., of reprobation of doubt; Paulus, Schleierm., Olsh., to some extent Weisse (bodiless personality), of guarding against injury (to his still weak physical nature). Of detention, spoke Baur, comp. Lightfoot, also Köstlin, Brückner, Steinm.; of making Jesus unclean, Wetstein; of Mary's being made unclean (by contact with a body that had come from the grave), Ammon. In order to decide amidst this confused crowd of opinions, it is plainly necessary to call in the aid of the following explicatory sentence, and this shows nothing but a haste that will not be impeded either in the way to the ascension which is to take place immediately, as the information to the disciples shows (Baur, Volkmar), or in quieting the fears of the disciples, which is to be brought about at once by means of Mary (of which Beza, Calov, Bengel, Hoffmann, Lange, think). All other explanations add what is not in the words.

¹ The opinion of Weisse and Baur, shared by Kinkel, Rothe, Hilg., Volkmar, Greve, that John xx. 17 has in view the immediate ascension, has been strongly opposed (comp. Meyer, Hase, Steinm.), and the subsequent proofs of the reality of the bodily nature, nay the subsequent quickly ending manifestations of the living Jesus upon earth, can be adduced against it. But the haste to get away from Mary, the solemn and definite announcement of the ascension sent to the disciples without any prospect given of a previous meeting, without any fresh reference to the ascension at the appearances to them, and without any subsequent narration of or allusion to the ascension, all this is in favour of the opinion that John xx. 17 contains the last words of the earthly Jesus, while verses 19 sqq. give the appearance of the Jesus (or God, verse 28) who has already ascended, although he is also thus a real personality.

² It is easy to detect here the additions to Luke xxiv. 36 sqq.

was absent on this evening, and to his companions' exclamations of joy he opposes a stiff-necked scepticism, like that of the young man in the history of Apollonius. He must see the marks of the nails in the hands, and must touch them, and must touch the side, before he will believe. Then Jesus, although he had already taken leave, comes once more from heaven to earth on the next Sunday, allows Thomas to examine him until he believes and cries, "My Lord and *my God!*" Jesus merely adds a word of consolation and admonition for the later Church, which is represented by the pious faith of John, but alarmed by the doubting *Gnosis*: "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed!"¹

Of less value are the spurious addenda which the Gospels of John and Mark later received.² The author of the addendum

¹ Comp. Rabbi Johanan to a mocking scholar, who thought the gems of the heavenly Jerusalem, described by the teacher, too large, since in the present life gems were scarcely of the size of a pigeon's egg, but was put to shame by a sight of large gems which the angels had cut: *Nebulo*, inquit, *nisi vidisses, non credidisses.* *Bav. Bathr.* f. 77, 1. *Sanh.* f. 100, 1, in Schöttgen, pp. 404, 1143. The young man in the history of Apollonius, who went to Tyana in order to obtain a proof of the doctrine of immortality, when he ultimately saw the dead Apollonius before him, sprang up in his sleep like one demented, and cried, as the sweat-drops fell from him: "I believe thee!" *Philostr. Vita Ap.* 8, 31.

² The spuriousness of the existing closing passages in John and Mark, not further discussed above in the critical introduction of Vol. I., is raised above all doubt. We confine ourselves here to John xxi. 1—25. Verse 25 is first quoted by Origen upon Matt., ap. Eus. 6, 25. Textual criticism condemns verse 25, not on the ground of Cod. 63, as is generally assumed, but of the much more weighty *Sinait.*, the first hand in which does not give the passage (comp. Tisch. *N. T. Sinait.* 1863, lx.; and his ed. maj. p. 965). But with this apocryphal passage—which has been given up by scholiasts and Antiochian authorities down to the most recent critics, down to Meyer (yet not by Hengst., Hölemann, Lange, Weitzel, and others)—must go also not merely verse 24, which introduces it (thus even Luthardt), but also the whole chapter, as is admitted by most critics from H. Grotius and Semler down to Lücke, De Wette, Credner, Bleek, A. Schweizer, Baur, and Scholten: although Rich. Simon, Mill, Wetstein, Eichh., Hug, Tholuck, and others, even Hilg. (*Zeitschrift*, 1868, pp. 434 sqq.), stand on the defensive side, and there is something plausible in the assumption that either the Apostle himself (R. Simon down to Meyer), or during his lifetime the trusty presbyter who had already helped in the Gospel (Ewald), composed this supplement. This is an assumption from which many of those who deny the genuineness do not stand far removed (H. Grotius, Wieseler, Bleek, Luthardt, Baüml.), when they think of the Ephesian presbyters, possibly John Presbyter, as the authors of and authentic witnesses (xxi. 24 sq., Bleek) to the Gospel of John soon after the death of the Apostle, or indeed before (Baüml.).

to John aims in part at giving what is a new evidence that Jesus is alive; with a singular oblivion of the appearance to Magdalene, and delighting in the round number, he calls it the third sign.¹ He also aims partly at connecting the appearances

Cleverly as the Johannine language, thought, and view are in general preserved in the chapter, the spuriousness betrays itself (1) by the dignified definitive close of the Gospel in xx. 29—31, in the face of which the addition of xxi. (Hilg. however speaks of organic connection with the second main division of the Gospel, comp. xiv. 21!) could be explained only by the dotage of John or by the indiscretion of his presbyters, the revelation to Peter of his death being in particular only a repetition of xiii. 36; (2) by the clear testimony of others as to John xxi. 24, which far outbids xix. 35, as well as by the unpleasantly boastful introduction of John (particularly verses 20 sqq.); (3) by its being inconsistent with the history of the resurrection in xx.: Galilean appearances against appearances at Jerusalem, material features against spiritual faith, new signs against the declining to report old signs, new promises instead of the old ones (xx. 23), third "manifestation" instead of fourth appearance (xxi. 14, comp. xx. 16 sq., 19, 26); (4) by its being inconsistent with the Gospel generally, which is enriched by Synoptic additions: a different order of the Apostles, mention of the sons of Zebedee (in the Gospel, never), Nathanael of Cana (comp. i. 44 sq.), Peter as fisher and catcher of fish (yet comp. i. 44), Peter as walker on the water (differently vi. 21), Peter as leader of the community (Matt. xvi. 18, comp. John i. 42, xx. 23), Peter as the man loves more (xxi. 15 and Matt. xxvi. 33; comp. John xiii. 37), finally John as the survivor perhaps to the second advent (*παρουσία*) (according to Matt. xvi. 28, and against the general promises to the Apostles, John xiv. 3, 18 sqq., xvi. 16, 22, &c.); (5) by the differences in the language, comp. Credner, *Einkl.* p. 232. Scholten, *Joh.* p. 57. Bäuml. pp. 191 sqq.

But the purpose of the piece is not merely, as is generally thought (even still Bleek, *Einkl.* p. 220), the explanation of the Lord's saying (xxi. 22 sq.) current in the Church, so that the narration previously might harmonize with it, or this narration as such (Bäuml. p. 191); the purpose is a more general one, and concerns the whole relation of Peter and John, but neither so that Peter, the head of the Roman Church, should be depreciated in favour of John, the pillar of the church of Asia Minor (Baur, Schwegler, Zeller), nor so that Peter should be simply restored (Volkmar). See above. A subordinate aim would be the adjustment of the Gospel of John with the Synoptics. The incitement to write the continuation would be given by xx. 30. The date of the origin of the chapter was an early one (comp. xxi. 25 in Origen, Eus. 6, 25; verse 18 in Tert., below, p. 318, n. 1), for the universal reception of the piece into the Gospel cannot be otherwise explained. It originated doubtless at the time of the rise of that cult of John in the church of Asia Minor, about A.D. 160, which lay at the foundation of the confusion of identity of the earlier deceased Apostle (above, V. p. 53, n. 2) and the Presbyter whose very long life and whose death are evidently thought of in xxi. 22 (since a protestation *before* the death, yet so late, would have been ridiculous).

¹ Comp. previous note. As to xxi. 14, it might be said that only the appearances to the "disciples" are reckoned (thus also Hilg. 1868, p. 441); but the author of the Gospel had in xx. given such prominence to Magdalene, and had so markedly made her the bearer of the most important news even to the Apostles, that only another writer could in xxi. have thus reckoned, and that less because he thought mulier tacet, than because he thus found a new triplet.

at Jerusalem with those in Galilee mentioned by the ancient Gospels; and partly (the weightiest motive) at creating in the last words of Jesus a prophetic basis to the life, work, and death of the apostolic rivals. The narrator is evidently one of the Johannine party, a panegyrist of John, who, as well as and since Peter, had already departed from this earthly stage; and quite in the style of the Gospel, he gives in delicate outlines the superiorities of John.¹ Yet he is a man who would like to adjust the differences of all the parties, and therefore endeavours to mediate fairly, in the Gospels and in the Church, between John and Peter, the head of Jewish Christianity, nay of the universal Church, who is to be placed in shadow by no literary artifices. To this mediation is devoted the new scene of a revelation of the risen Lord, which is transferred to Galilee because the lake is needed, and because the scene must bridge over the gulf between the narratives.²

He presents us, therefore, with the following story. Seven Apostles are together at the Lake of Tiberias, five of whom are named: first, Peter; last, the two sons of Zebedee, particularly John, the younger of the two, whom Jesus loved, the last survivor among the Apostles; in the midst, Thomas the doubter, and Nathanael, the first confessor of the Son of God.³ After the sad catastrophe, Peter—the Apostle having again become a fisherman—will try his fortune at fishing, about which the ancient Gospels have said so much, the fourth Gospel nothing. The others, without vocation, we might say like him inconsolable, without

¹ Death of the Apostles, xxi. 19, 21; comp. against Ewald and Meyer, above, p. 314, note; also see Baur, preference for John.

² Correct and incorrect features in Volkmar's opinion, *Rel. Jesu*, p. 489, and *Himmelfahrt Mose*, p. 61, that Peter was restored to full superiority. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 293, speaks of the saving of honour. Comp. also Späth, *Hilg. Zeitschrift*, 1868, pp. 193 sq., who moreover makes a mistake in believing that the later presidency of the Church was committed to John, whereby the palm was therefore left with him: but of this there is nothing in the Gospel. Hilg. *Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 447, on the other hand, finds nothing of Petrinism. The attempt at adjustment between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics is seen in the introduction of a Galilean appearance, and mainly in the copious interweaving of Synoptic tradition (see above, p. 314, note).

³ Noack, III. p. 191, now discovers in Judas (Thaddæus) the favourite disciple.

aim, accompany him. The futile and the fortunate fishing of the Galilean spring-time, as depicted by Luke, now repeats itself with a difference. The night toil is in vain; with the morning light, however, Jesus stands unrecognized on the shore, addresses the "children," exhorts them to cast the net on the right side—not exactly into the Gentile world in antithesis to the unproductive Jewish world, but on the side of the good fortune which he, as heavenly Master of the kingdom, dispenses. They obey him, and one hundred and fifty-three large fishes, the number of the name of Simon Peter and the prophecy of a world-mission in great figures, are the booty of the fishers, of the fishers of men; and this time—a sign of the indestructibility of the universal Church—the net is not torn, heavy as it is to lift.¹ Late, yet the first of the company, John recognizes the Lord because of the draught of fish; and the profounder presentiment of

¹ John xxi. 6, 8, 11; comp. Luke v. 6, Matt. iv. 18 sq., xiii. 47, xvii. 27. Partiality for John leads its defenders to find in the take of fish in John a more genuine account than in Luke (see Meyer, and even Hase); and Meyer goes so far as to make the denial of the historical character of John a crime. The symbolical significance of the take of fish was recognized by the ancients (Chrys., Aug.). Also Severus, Ammon., Theoph., made the 153 fishes refer to the conversion of the Gentiles (100 heathens, 50 Jews, 3 the Trinity!), whilst Jerome, in his commentary on Ezekiel xlvi., found in the number only universality in general, omnia genera piscium (Matt. xiii. 47); comp. Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 195; Hilg. *Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 446; on the other hand, Strauss has his doubts, *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 133. Hengstenberg, again, II. p. 336, found (after Weitzel, who thought of the unproductive toil in Israel, *Studien*, 1849, p. 618; similarly Hilg. 1868, p. 446) the fulness of the Gentiles indicated, according to 2 Chron. ii. 17, where Solomon reckons the strangers in Israel at 153,600. Of these suppositions the best is that of Jerome; although Oppian's *Halieutica* belong to the close of the second century and are later than the Gospel,—although, further, these writings do not mention (by addition) 153, nor merely *large* classes of fishes, but reckon *all*, yet Jerome refers to *Halieutica* generally, comp. Strauss and Hilg. More plausible than any of these suppositions, however, is the conjecture of Dr. Egli, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 135, according to which the numbers of the letters in Shimeon Jonah, that is in Peter's name, make up 153. With simpler reckoning, and that according to the position of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet and not according to their value as numerals, Volkmar (*Himmelf. Mose*, p. 62) found Shimeon bar Jona Kepha, for which I, according to John xxi. 15 sqq., comp. i. 42, would more correctly substitute, Shimeon (71) Johanna (53) Kepha (29). For such explanation also Späth, *Hilg. Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 193, and Noack, IV. p. 268; on the contrary, Hilg. *l.c.* p. 446. But Hilg. ought not to say that such a reckoning was unheard of, comp. Rev. xiii. 18, Matt. i. 17 (14 = David); for does not the alphabet lie directly at the foundation of the value of the letters as numerals, up to ten?

John is followed by the vigorous action of Peter, who girds his outer garment about him and, as previously in Matthew, leaps into the lake and gets to Jesus on the shore.¹ Wonderful to relate, on the shore burns a fire of coals, there is a fish upon it, and bread, as if Jesus had prepared himself a breakfast. It would have been very natural to cook some of the freshly-caught fish, and to nourish themselves with the fruit of their own labour which had been blessed by the Lord. But since it would not be fitting to roast the converts, and because a little miracle of feeding is appropriate to the risen Lord, the one hundred and fifty-three fishes are only looked at, and the one little fish is eaten by and is sufficient for the seven. Jesus distributes bread and fish, without eating any himself; the disciples know, without asking, that it is the Lord.²

But this is only the introduction. After breakfast, Jesus has to put Peter to the blush, to steel him, finely and severely to prepare him for his future. Thrice he asks him—ashamed of and triumphant over his three denials—about his love; the first time he questions him most painfully and searchingly as to the excess of his love over that of the others, even of John. Thrice, the last time with a grieved spirit but also with greater emphasis, the disciple appeals to the heart of his Master, and without comparison with others, without arrogance, makes protestation of his love. Thrice Jesus charges him to feed his sheep.³ But even the most devout protestation is not enough, although it is rewarded with unreserved re-institution into a post of the greatest responsibility. Jesus finally refers obscurely to the girding of the outer garment, in order to announce to Peter for the days of his old age the last girding preparatory to

¹ John xxi. 7; comp. Matt. xiv. 28.

² John xxi. 10 may suggest that some of the fish which had been caught had been cooked; but verses 9, 12 sq., exclude this meaning, and Chrys. already rightly saw in the passage a miraculous feeding. On the other hand, Meyer thinks the *ὅψ.* in verse 9 is collective (comp. vi. 9), and that in verse 10 the provision is completed.

³ John xxi. 15 refers less to John xiii. 37 than to Matt. xxvi. 33.

execution, the following even unto crucifixion which he had alluded to already on the evening of his farewell, the stern reality by which words were to be converted into deeds, the last expiation of his fall.¹ Peter then assumes the part of a rival, and, as he is going after Jesus, asks what is to be the fate of John who is following him. "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." Thus Peter is corrected; and John is honoured with the great promise which Jesus previously addressed indefinitely to "some," and is superabundantly compensated for the loss of the primacy of the Church, conferred upon Peter, by the fact that his spotless love has remained unquestioned, by his supremacy in personal fellowship with the Lord, and by his prospect of the longest life, if not indeed of living to see the return of the heavenly bosom friend.² An unhistorical myth of the Church is here adopted and carefully re-shaped, although older sayings of Jesus expressly contradict it.³

The appendix to Mark, which has unfortunately taken the place of the genuine conclusion of this Gospel, is in its commencement a violent attempt at adjustment between Mark and Luke-John, between Galilee and Jerusalem.⁴ The chief effort

¹ The Church found here an allusion to the crucifixion of Peter, which was perhaps inferred merely from the passage in Tert. *Scorp.* 15: hinc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur. But bound prisoners were first carried (verse 18). Comp. Acts xxi. 11. Yet John xxi. 19, 22, points to a similarity of death, comp. xii. 33, xiii. 36. For the rest, the martyrdom of Peter is well attested: 1 Clem. 5, comp. 6 (Rev. xviii. 20), and Heracl. Clem. *Strom.* 4, 9, 73. Comp. his encouragement to his wife who was being led to death, 7, 11, 63. The death (on the cross) at Rome—distinctly excluded by 1 Clem. *l.c.*, notwithstanding recent uncertainties—first attested by Clem. *Hom.* (Clem. Jacob. 1, 19), Dion. Cor. ad Rom. Eus. 2, 25; Cajus adv. Procl. *ib.* Origen ap. Eus. 3, 1. Tert. *Præser.* 36; *Scorp.* 15. Jerome, *V. ill.* 1. Lact. *Mar. Pers.* 2; *Instit.* 4, 21. *Acta Petr. et Paul.* 79 sqq. His flight before his death finely given, *ib.* Comp. also Lipsius, *Quellen der röm. Petr. Sage*, 1872, pp. 47, 94.

² Comp. Matt. xvi. 28; above, IV. p. 270.

³ Comp. besides Matt. xvi. 28, also xx. 23; above, V. p. 53.

⁴ The spuriousness, or at any rate imperfect integrity, of the section, Mark xvi. 9—20, is shown—quite differently from that of the last chapter of John—by external textual evidence. These verses are wanting in Sin. and Vat., also It. Bobb., Taur.;

is directed towards a harmony with Luke, whose resurrection-trilogy is repeated; John is called to mind by Magdalene and the weeping of the disciples; Matthew, by both the genuine commencement and the close.¹ Of the last words of Jesus we shall have to speak further on. Attempts to restore the genuine Mark have been repeatedly made; most probably Mark corre-

Cod. Reg. gives, together with the existing close, a very different and much shorter one (also 274 and Syr. Whit.); and a long series of Fathers, from Severus, Hesychius, Ammonius, Euseb., Jerome, down to the Scholiasts on the codd. (see Tisch. and commentators, also Klosterm. *Mark*. 1867, pp. 298 sqq.), make Mark end at verse 8. The first use made of this section in Irenæus, 3, 10, 6: in fine ev. ait Marcus: et quidem dominus (verse 19). Perhaps already Celsus, 2, 55 (Mark xvi. 9). Scholten, p. 253, and Volkmar, mention with less certainty Just. *Ap.* 1, 45. Nothing is to be concluded from Acts xxviii. 3 and Pap. ap. Eus. 3, 39, comp. Mark xvi. 18. On the other hand, *Acta Pil.* 14 uses Mark. The internal grounds are also convincing: however much Mark may have been an epitomizer of Matt. and Luke (towards which opinion the conclusion still further inclines De Wette, Baur, Strauss, Bleek), he could not have so slavishly, so senselessly, made use of his predecessors as to transfer to Jerusalem all the appearances which had been announced for Galilee (xvi. 7), and while he borrowed directly from Luke, yet—an utter impossibility—to make use of John (xvi. 9). Other grounds in Credner, Fritzsche, Meyer, and others. No weight attaches to the explanations of the loss of the assumed genuine finish from exegetical scruples (De Wette), or because parchment or paper was wanting to complete a codex (Bleek, II. p. 503). Since Rich. Simon, Mill, Bengel, Eichhorn, the genuineness has been defended by very few; by several, as notably by Hug, now also by Noack, II. p. 103, by the remarkable assumption that Mark himself added the section. It can be assumed, not that Mark was hindered, by death or other accidents, from completing his Gospel (Fritzsche, Schott, Klosterm.), or that, in accordance with the most ancient conception, he did not reckon the appearances as belonging to the earthly ministry of Jesus, or perhaps described or wished to describe them in a second book (like Luke, perhaps preserved in Luke's Gospel), Weiss, *Markusev.* 1872, p. 511; but that he could not close with verse 8 (again Schenkel, Weiss), that his genuine conclusion—mainly derived from Matthew—was destroyed by a later writer (editor: Köstlin, Scholten), who wanted a more copious history of the resurrection and a harmony of the Gospels.

¹ The spurious conclusion has, like Luke, the three members: (a) Facts at the grave, verses 9—11; (b) the wayfarers of Emmaus, verses 12 sq.; (c) appearances to the eleven, commissions and promises, verses 14—20. In the first portion, the observation of the women at the grave is completed by the appearance to Magd., the woman formerly possessed (after Luke viii. 2), based on the Johannine narration, since we cannot think of the editor of Matt. (xxviii. 9), who mentions a Mary besides Magdalene, therefore two women. The weeping Apostles, Mark xvi. 10, after John xvi. 20. The unbelief, after Luke xxiv. 11. In the second portion, the unbelief of the disciples is not in harmony with Luke xxiv. 33 sq., but with verses 25, 37 sq., and in its heightened development is quite in the style of Mark, c. g. viii. 17 sqq. In the third portion, the predominant reference is to Luke xxiv. 36—53, comp. Matt. xxviii. 16—20. This will be dwelt upon more fully when we treat of the ascension.

sponded generally to Matthew, and the more copious description of the farewell of Jesus, verses 15—20, were on the whole faithfully borrowed from the lost original.¹

Among the non-Biblical authorities, the Gospel of the Hebrews occupies a remarkable position. In its oldest form it has points of contact with Luke; and with respect to the appearances at Jerusalem and the handling of the body of Jesus, that work and Luke were perhaps fed from one and the same source. On the other hand, the guard at the grave, and the first appearance to the brother James instead of to Peter—which was read in this work in the fourth century—are to be ascribed to a later growth, which has also been made use of by the editor of Matthew. Contrary to all evidence, the risen Lord here appears to unbelievers, and gives to the high-priest's servant—who is placed among the guards at the grave, Gentile or Jewish, as he was previously among the officials in Gethsemane—his grave-clothes, presumably as a compensation for the former loss of his ear. Then he goes to his brother James—whom Paul indeed mentions, but last, not first—and appears to him. James obtained the preference because he was the head of Jewish Christianity at Jerusalem; he is said to have vowed after the last supper, at which, however, he was not present, to eat no more bread until he had seen the risen Lord. Jesus takes with him some bread, blesses and breaks it and gives it to James: "My brother, eat thy bread, because the Son of Man is risen from among those

¹ Attempts at restoration according to Matt.—which Hilg. *Ev.* p. 144, renounces—particularly in Ewald, *Ev.*; also in *Gesch.* VI. 3rd ed. pp. 108, 112; comp. Holtzm. p. 99. Buusen, pp. 431 sqq. Scholten, *Alt. Ev.* pp. 231, 253. Volkmar, p. 606; not without arbitrariness, comp. Bleek, II. p. 501. Weiss, p. 514. Volkmar will retain in particular verses 15 sq., 19 sq.; but I do not see why not also verses 17 sq., which are in Mark's style (see below). The description of the joy of the women is Volkmar's fancy; the rejection of the harmonistic attempt and the approximation to Matt., however, are quite right. Scholten (p. 231), upon insufficient grounds (especially on account of the different designation of Mary, xv. 40, 47, xvi. 1), goes so far as to deny also xvi. 1—8 to the proto-Mark. Thus he has a Gospel without a resurrection, such as Noack desires (see below, p. 333, n. 3; according to him, Mark, bishop of Jerusalem, Eus. 4, 6, himself made the addition later).

that sleep.”¹ He now goes to Peter and the others, whom he must first convince that he is alive: “Handle and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit;” and they handle him and believe.² These handlings are described also in other writings. According to a tradition mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, John, the beloved disciple, himself handled the Lord, and experienced the miracle that the glorified flesh offered no resistance to his hand, however deeply he thrust it.³ In the work on the resurrection ascribed to Justin Martyr, the disciples that doubt the reality of the body of Jesus make all kinds of experiments at his own desire; they handle him, they look at him on all sides, and finally ask him to eat of the bread and fish, the consumption of which is, in the appendix to John, reserved for them alone.⁴

A last great amplification of this world of myth is found in the Acts of Pilate, a work which has for its foundation the whole of our Gospel literature, and in its second form exhibits an advance upon its first in the growth of myth.⁵ Here we find fresh appearances, fresh witnesses, ocular demonstrations

¹ Jerome, *Vir. illus.* 2: *ev. quoque, quod appellatur sec. Hebræos, etc., post resurrectionem salvat. refert: dominus autem quum dedisset sindonem suam servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jac., se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, qua biberet calicem domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a mortuis. Rursusque post paululum: tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et post dedit Jacobo iusto et dixit ei: frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis a mortuis.*

² Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 3 (also Eus. 3, 36): *καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν (ἐλήλυθεν), ἔφη αὐτοῖς. λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτε οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν.* Jerome, *Vir. illus.* 16, found this passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews. Origen found it (*Princip. proœm.* 8) in the *Doctrina Petri*. It is possible that this passage is independent of Luke, and even that it is an earlier and simpler form than Luke xxiv. 36 sqq., for this form of the Gospel of the Hebrews belongs to the middle of the second century. Noteworthy also is the prominence given to Peter, and to the belief of the disciples, opp. Luke. The words about eating and drinking with the disciples can, however (Ignat. *l.c.*), be derived from Acts x. 41. Comp. Hilg. *N. T. extra Can.* IV. pp. 17, 29.

³ Clem. Al. *Adumbr. in 1 Joa.* i. 1 (opp. Klotz, IV. p. 58): *fertur in traditionibus, quoniam Jo. ipsum corpus, quod erat extrinsecus, tangens manum s. in profunda misisse et ei duritiam carnis nullo modo reluctatam esse, sed locum manui præbuisse discipuli.*

⁴ Just. *Resurr.* 9 (among other things: *πανταχόθεν αὐτὸν κατανοήσαντες*), comp. Anger, *Synopse*, pp. 258 sq.

⁵ *Acta Pil.* A. and B. Heightened in B.

to Jews and Gentiles, and at the close the penitent faith even of the Sanhedrim, or at any rate of Annas and Caiaphas. At midnight, Jesus rises in the sight of 500 soldiers, who with the women also hear the words of the angels.¹ Immediately afterwards he appears to the victim of faithful devotion, Joseph of Arimathæa, who for his defence of Jesus has since Friday evening been himself guarded and sealed in a kind of sepulchral cave without window, and, sentenced to death on the Sabbath, is to die on Sunday.² Jesus enters while he is praying, baptizes him, leads him out of his prison, without breaking the seal, to his own grave, then to Arimathæa, where he places him in bed, and bids him remain there forty days beyond the time of Jesus's sojourn in Galilee.³ On Sunday morning there is no Joseph in the prison, and—new Job's messengers—the soldiers announce the resurrection of Jesus. "Give us Joseph," cry the Sanhedrists, "and we will give you Jesus!"⁴ The guards are bribed with many pieces of silver, and are at the same time said to be bribed by the Apostles; then come fresh witnesses, three men of Galilee, from the 500 Rabbins who are faithful to the Law, a priest, a teacher, and a Levite—according to the second form, a priest, a Levite, and a soldier—who have seen Jesus's farewell and ascension from the hill Malek, the Hill of the King. But these inconvenient witnesses are also bribed and removed by the authorities to Galilee.⁵ The distress, the contention, is now great; Nicodemus advises that Jesus be sought throughout the whole country, as he may, like Elijah, be cast upon a mountain or into a valley.⁶ He is not to be found, but Joseph is discovered and in a friendly spirit invited to Jerusalem.⁷ The policy is

¹ *Acta Pil.* 13. Comp. Tert. *Ap.* 21: magna militaris custodiæ diligentia.

² *Acta Pil.* 12.

³ *Ib.* 15.

⁴ *Ib.* 12 sq.

⁵ *Ib.* 14. The name is very doubtful. Tisch. in Rec. I. reads with A. Mamilch, but B. has Mambech, E. Malek; Latin translation has Mambre sive Malech. Greek II. has Galilean Mount of Olives! Tisch. connects with Mamilch the false god Milkom (Malkam) on the Mount of Olives, 2 Kings xxiii. 13. Thilo, p. 621 (Klosterm., p. 304), thinks of bar haimmelech near Jerusalem. The 500 (1 Cor. xv.) in Greek II.

⁶ *Acta Pil.* 15, comp. 2 Kings ii. 16.

⁷ *Acta Pil.* 15.

now reversed; the three men of Galilee are once more brought forward and examined; even in the Sanhedrim voices are heard to compare the end of Jesus with that of Enoch, Moses, and Elijah; but eventually Annas and Caiaphas maintain, in spite of all the facts, the condemnation of the crucified one, of the man who hung upon the wood.¹

3.—*The Explanation of the Facts.*

This digression into the world of myth has delayed the decision as to the accredited facts. With impatience we return from the digression to the great question that so deeply interests us. The fact stands fast, not indeed, as was always supposed, that the grave was empty, but that the Apostles looked upon their Lord again after his death, or were thoroughly convinced that they did so.

How is this to be explained, this vision, this living again, of one that was dead? To seek for a natural explanation is no crime among reasonable men, but a right and a duty, the duty of religion that seeks the truth; it is doubly the duty of history, which must sacrifice the dearest tradition to certain fact, the romantic play of miracle to the invariability of earthly law. It may be that history cannot find such an explanation; but this should not prevent her from seeking it, instead of at once renouncing the task.

All the attempts at explanation hitherto made—from theft of the corpse and apparent death to illusions of the excited disciples—have been of the character of natural explanations. We can only distinguish a grosser and a subtler natural explanation, the former based upon the assumption of external, material facts, for the most part possessing but little credibility, the latter based upon the supposition of inner, mental processes. Both explanations have, indeed, been often remarkably inter-

¹ *Ib.* 16. In the Latin version, 28 (12), Annas and Caiaphas give way; only in A. they beg Pilate to keep their confession secret, whilst in B. 27 (11), crushed in the defeat of Judaism, they await God's punishment, and yet do not repent.

woven: the empty grave and the apparent death have given rise to the convictions of the disciples, while the visions again have been based upon an empty grave. Belief and unbelief have also remarkably grouped themselves around these explanations. These natural phenomena were first brought forward by unbelief, by antagonism to Christianity, by the Jews and by Celsus, down to the Deists and the Illuminists; recently, from the rise of Rationalism downwards, it has been faith, at any rate the faith of reason, that has attempted to serve the cause of Christianity by a restoration of its natural light.

The crudest explanation has been mentioned by the New Testament itself; and that the New Testament has mentioned it to condemn it, has in the end procured for it a wider acceptance than has been accorded to any other. The editor of Matthew says that the Jewish leaders circulated the rumour that the disciples of Jesus stole his corpse in the night. In point of fact, this explanation was really given by the later Jews, as is expressly shown in the second century by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, and then by the Acts of Pilate; and the venomous Jewish book of the middle ages consistently made use of it.¹ Even in the last century the well-known Fragmentist, Reimarus, did not find this statement beneath notice. In order to continue their easy life of dependence upon the "Saviour's Purse," the disciples of Jesus had recourse to audacious inventions, purloined the body of Jesus before it had been buried twenty-four hours, played at the burial-place the comedy of the empty grave, and delayed the public announcement of the resurrection until the fiftieth day, when the decay of the body had become complete. Does not Matthew himself point to this fact, and is it not evident from his account that the Christians were obliged to allow the charge of the authorities to pass without contradiction?² Other critics have remained satisfied with

¹ Matt. xxviii. 13. *Acta Pil.* A. 13. Justin, *Trypho*, 108. Tert. *Ap.* 21; *Spect.* 30. Comp. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 56. Jewish book in Eisenmenger, I. pp. 189 sqq. Comp. above, I. p. 23; VI. p. 270.

² Pp. 230 sqq.

the general assumption of fraud. Celsus the pagan, in the second century, finds among many explanations of the resurrection—one of which being fraud by Jesus—that that is the best according to which Mary of Magdala intentionally startles the others by a lie and opens the way to further impostures. These further artifices of daring falsehood, the invention of meetings with Jesus down to the time of his ascension, honourably believed by many Christians, Reimarus also has ascribed to the Apostles.¹ All these assumptions are repellent and disgraceful; they show that the holy conviction of the Apostles and the first Christians—which Origen triumphantly appealed to against Celsus—has not in the slightest degree influenced the hardened minds of such critics.²

A very different character is given to the situation by the assertion that self-deception at the grave was produced by external circumstances. As early as the time of Tertullian, many Jews and heathens held that the gardener of the sepulchre garden had removed the corpse, in order (as Tertullian, perhaps first, derisively added) that his lettuces should not suffer from the trampling of many visitors. But quite recently Schleiermacher and Ewald have held that a misunderstanding was caused by the definitive burial which they, on the basis of John, have erroneously assumed to follow the first and provisional one; whilst Renan has groped about after Jews, and garden-owners, Galilean disciples who took their Lord away with them, and finally Mary of Bethany or Magdala: and Réville, again, gives his sanction to the possibility that Pilate, regretting his concession, subsequently caused the corpse to be buried in another place, or, still better, that the Sanhedrists brought this about by the aid of the soldiers, craftily leaving the linen behind, in order to prevent the identification of the already putrefying

¹ Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 55 (of Magdal. and others): ἡ, ὅπερ μᾶλλον, ἐκπλήξαι τοὺς λοιποὺς τῇ τερατείᾳ τοιαύτῃ θελήσας καὶ διὰ τοῦ τοιοῦτου ψεύσματος ἀφορμὴν ἄλλοις ἀγύρταις παρασχεῖν. 7, 35 (of Jesus): τὸν τούτους ἐξαπατήσαντα (namely, by visions, see below).

² Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 56.

body by means of the grave-clothes.¹ Other critics make another use of this linen—it helps to lead those who visit the grave to fancy that they see angels or Jesus; Noack and even Bunsen have dwelt upon the spectral appearance of this linen to the women.² The possibility, at any rate, is here admitted of an accidental emptying of the grave unknown to the disciples, the work, not of Joseph of Arimathæa nor of Pilate, but of the enemies of Jesus or of a violent mob, who would not allow the dead to rest. Plundering of graves and sacrilege were common enough in antiquity among both Gentiles and Jews; and the ashes of the Christians of Lyons were thrown into the Rhone in order to cut off all hope of a resurrection.³ This possibility is not to be denied; for who will maintain that, in such a case, the Sanhedrists—who probably would know nothing of the proceeding—must have come forward against the Christians with an appeal to the actual removal of the corpse? In the first place, however, this hypothesis would not explain the appearances of Jesus to the disciples; and in the second place, the emptiness of the grave remains altogether doubtful to the critics.

The advocates of the more recent opinion, that the death of Jesus was only an apparent one, imagine that they have most convincingly explained the alleged empty grave as well as the appearances of Jesus. Bahrdt and others have introduced this explanation with the fatal assumption of fraud on the part of Jesus himself: Jesus bowed his head betimes in order that he

¹ *Tert. Spect.* 30: hic est, quem clam discentes subripuerunt, ut resurrexisse dicatur, vel hortulanus detraxit, ne lactucæ suæ frequentia commeantium læderentur. Schleierm. p. 471; comp. Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 81. Also A. Schweizer, *Prot. K.-Z.* 1864; Renan, *Apôtres*, pp. 38—43. Réville, *La Resurrection*, 1869, pp. 29 sq. The empty grave was formerly made a starting-point by Schmidt, *Bibl. f. Krit. und Exeg.* II. pp. 536 sqq. Also 1838, Hennell, *Unters. über Urspr. d. Christ.* pp. 117 sqq.

² Schmidt, *l.c.* pp. 545 sqq. Paulus, III. ii. pp. 855 sqq. (angels). Noack on the Resurrection of the Crucified in the Light of Modern Science, *Psyche*, 1861, pp. 133 sqq. Bunsen, p. 422.

³ 2 Kings xxiii. 16; Jer. viii. 1; Baruch ii. 24. Jos. *Ant.* 16, 7, 1; 18, 2, 3. Diod. 13, 86; 14, 63. Ep. Lugdun. in Eus. 5, 1. The emperor Diocletian caused his chamberlains to be taken out of the grave and thrown into the sea, Eus. 8, 6.

might afterwards be healed and appear as if miraculously; or at any rate his adherents took the precaution to make his restoration to life possible by means of a stupefying drink and of an early removal from the cross—views which even Venturini rejected with indignation.¹ Since the beginning of this century, Paulus in Heidelberg has been the most prominent advocate of this opinion, though without the additions just mentioned; and he has been followed by the popularizing Venturini.² The fact of the resurrection of Jesus has, according to Paulus, all possible credibility, for the opposition of the Sadducees to Christianity is explained by this fact; and the answer to all questionings is as formerly, “God has done this,” though not by a special act of omnipotence, but mediately through the forces of nature. In the youthful body of Jesus, weakened by no passions, the abode of a cheerful and pious mind, the vital forces, though suddenly strained by excessive irritation and maltreatment, were not exhausted. He became torpid, respiration and consciousness were suspended; but he could not have been dead, according to the testimony of physicians and of so many accredited narrations. In the spring time the sepulchre of Jesus had a medium temperature, peculiarly suitable to his needs and to the gradual dissolving of the stimulating oily fluid spices. The body was protected by the linen wrappings. The non-fatal wounds had, with the aid of the Eternal Wisdom which watched over the loved one, the effect of blood-letting, and, when the vital activity was afresh aroused, checked the first violent flow of the blood to the nobler parts. Hence Jesus gradually revived; white-robed adherents, perhaps Essenes, opened his grave; and he left the place of the dead in gardener’s clothes which happened to be at hand. After the excessive exertions of the first day, he kept himself more private, and rested and nursed his fatigued body,

¹ K. Fr. Bahrdt, on the plan and purpose of Jesus, 1784, see in Paulus, III. ii. p. 793. Plan of the adherents: in the *Xenodoxien*, see Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 628. But comp. also Gfrörer, *Urchrist.* III. pp. 241 sqq. Venturini, II. ii. pp. 30 sqq.

² Paulus, *Handb.* III. ii. pp. 826 sqq.; *L. J.* pp. 277 sqq. Venturini, pp. 189 sqq. Previously Schuster, *Eichh. Bibl.* IX. p. 1053.

during which time his unknown coadjutors undertook the duties of guardians and providers. After he had from time to time left his unknown asylum and had appeared in disguise to his followers here and there from Galilee to Jerusalem, at last when he found that the feverish wasting of his strength was increasing, in order to spare his followers the sight of the dissolution of his earthly nature, perhaps also in order to die, like Moses and Apollonius, without witnesses, he took his farewell on the Mount of Olives, when a cloud did him the service of snatching his person from the eyes of the assembled company. Venturini has yet more vividly described the fainting, and the lance-thrust which fortunately wounds only the lower part of the body; then the beneficial influence of the air, of the perfumes, of the open wounds, of the *byssus* strips, of the bed of moss, even of the shaking earthquake, and finally of the sleep and food and the affecting ministrations of Joseph, Nicodemus, and others of the Essene brotherhood. Jesus dwells sometimes in a sequestered quarter of Jerusalem, sometimes in Galilee; he ascends Carmel and the Mount of Olives; and once more, before his ardently longed-for but carefully-concealed dissolution, he gathers up his strength to appear near Damascus to Paul, who subsequently became an Apostle. The excellent Jacob Andreas Brennecke even brings forward scriptural proof that Jesus lived upon the earth twenty-seven years after his resurrection, and continued to labour in secret for the good of mankind.¹ Without allowing imagination to carry them so far, in fact with as much reservation as possible, Ammon, Herder, Theile, even Schleiermacher and others of the school, have spoken in favour of apparent death.²

¹ So runs the title of his work, Lüneb. 1819, comp. Hase, p. 284.

² Ammon, *Fortbild.* II. i. p. 8; more guarded in his *L. J.* II. pp. 451 sqq. Herder, in detail in Paulus, III. ii. p. 794, and Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 12. Thiess, in Paulus, III. ii. p. 783. Theile, *Zur Biogr. J.* 1837, pp. 69 sqq. Schleierm. *L. J.* pp. 449 sqq. See further in my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 132. Strauss, *Chr. des Glaubens*, p. 178. But even Lücke speaks, as Schleierm. does, of a return to the course of a perfectly human life (comp. Bleek, II. p. 489); and Winer (article *Jesus*) of a new capability of dying. Bunsen also, *L. J.* p. 425, knows only of a death-like torpidity. "Perfect unconsciousness as in tetanus." Hase, p. 277, speaks

But Bunsen reverted to the old colours, and allowed Jesus soon after to find death finally in Phœnicia, where he was visiting the "other sheep."¹

The strongest point in favour of this theory is the absence of formal proof of death, and the abstract possibility of a subsequent return to life and consciousness. In fact, the only certain sign of death is putrefaction, which in this case cannot be established.² If death really occurred to Jesus, as has been believed, and as it is possible and probable that it did, it came so unusually soon that even Pilate is said to have been astonished. Tertullian and Origen have called in the aid of a divine miracle, and modern physicians have emphasized everything—exhaustion, agony, lance-wound—which would help to explain death and to ward off the possibility of an apparent death.³ It was not impossible that, if the exhaustion, the commencing deadly weakness, which might have brought about the end, were checked in good time, in the last fortunate moment, by reviving antidotes, a resuscitation of the apparently dead might have been effected. It had now and then actually occurred among the Persians, the Jews, and the Romans, that the crucified, taken down from the cross betimes, had been saved.⁴ Dr. Paulus would appeal to the crucifixion-tortures and ostentations of the French Jansenists, the so-called Appellants and Securists of the eighteenth century, notably sisters Francisca and Maria, who were repeatedly—the former twenty times—crucified for hours at a time with nails

of strong proof of the miraculous healing power which Jesus had at his command, and on this occasion exercised upon himself; p. 275, mention is made of the mystery of his subsequent sojourn. These views (although, in the combination of voluntary effort and dying, not perceptibly in a higher style than that of Bahrdt) go back ultimately to the Schleiermacherian basis. Quite recently, J. A. M. Meusinger, *Zeitstimmen*, 1870, No. 20, has advocated the theory of apparent death on the old grounds.

¹ Bunsen, pp. 434 sq., 474.

² Thus Ammon, Schleierm. *l.c.*

³ The Fathers, above, p. 169, n. 2. Then the extracts from the writings of the physicians Richter, Vogler, Gruner, in Paulus, III. ii. pp. 781 sqq. Particularly C. Fr. Gruner, *Diss. d. J. Chr. morte vera, non synoptica*, Jena, 1800, arrived only at a mors *opinabilis* per synopen: the lance-wound completed the certainty of death for him.

⁴ Herodotus, 7, 194. Cic. *C. Verr.* 5, 6; *ad Quint. fr.* 1, 2, 2, Jos. *Vita*, 75.

both in hands and feet. Here indeed begins the improbability. The pious artifices of the Appellant women, among whom Francisca earned annually two thousand livres, have been speedily rejected by Paulus; and of the three crucified friends of Josephus, whose deliverance the latter succeeded in obtaining from Titus, only one survived, the two others having succumbed despite the most assiduous nursing.¹ Bretschneider has already found that this example does little to support the assumption.² Unless the Essene physicians were previously provided, Jesus, if he was not dead, must have died in the grave for lack of attention and from the unfavourable influences of the damp cold air, as well as the stupefying perfumes—alleged to be helpful—in the confined space of the sepulchre.³ And what impossibilities meet us, from the rolling away of the stone to the restless travelling, those long journeys between Jerusalem and Galilee with his utterly exhausted vital forces, even if we grant to Dr. Paulus that his feet had not been pierced! Then there is the most impossible thing of all: the poor, weak, sick Jesus, with difficulty holding himself erect, in hiding, disguised, and finally dying—this Jesus, an object of faith, of exalted emotion, of the triumph of his adherents, a risen conquerer and Son of God! Here, in fact, the theory begins to grow paltry, absurd, worthy only of rejection, since it makes the Apostles either miserable victims of deceit or, with Jesus, themselves deceivers. For they would then have had a suspicion of the apparent death, and the condition of Jesus must have shown them that there was no question

¹ See the supplement by Paulus (to Bretschneider), III. ii. pp. 929 sqq., after Von Malten's *Bibl. der neuesten Weltkunde*, 1830, XII. pp. 156 sqq. On the other hand, *Allg. K.-Z.* 1833, No. 33. No help is to be gained from the notorious crucifixion at Wildenspuch, near Schaffhausen (Margaret Peters, March 15, 1823). Description by Meyer, 1824, pp. 143 sqq.; C. Pestalozzi, *Herzog*, XXI. pp. 507 sqq. *Jos. Vita*, 75: ὁ δ' εὐθὺς ἐκέλευσε καθαιρεθῆντας αὐτοῦς θεραπείας ἐπιμελεστάτης τυχεῖν. Καὶ οἱ μὲν δύο τελευτῶσι θεραπευόμενοι, ὁ δὲ τρίτος ἔζησεν.

² Bretschneider on the alleged apparent death of Jesus, *Stud. und Krit.* 1832, pp. 625 sqq. Comp. also Klaiber, *Stud. der würt Geistl.* II. ii. 84 sqq.

³ Winer, article *Jesus*, refers to the stupefying and suffocating effects of the sweet spices.

in this case of a resurrection. If Jesus were looked upon as one who had risen, if he gave himself out as such, there was a lack of sober thought; and if he took pains not to betray his condition, there was after all a lack of honesty also. On these grounds, the theory of apparent death has in recent times been rejected by critics almost without exception.¹

Critics have left off seeking an explanation from external facts. But there is still a world of mental facts, that enigmatical world of thoughts and feelings which establishes itself in the inner life of men—particularly in the domain of religious conviction and inspiration—so firmly as to become to the believer more certain than the external world that stands tangibly and undeniably before his eyes, until at last this inner world, by the active power of the will, as before on the wings of fancy, projects itself into the external world, and the pious eye thinks it sees what the burning heart commands and believes. Long before Strauss and Renan, indeed exactly seventeen hundred years ago, the ancient opponent Celsus had transferred the myth of the resurrection to this inner domain, and had published the supposition that Mary of Magdala—a woman who had been possessed—and with her this one or that out of the company possessing a peculiar mental character, favoured the world with a dream-vision, or with a fancy of her own coining, or—and this pleased him best—with an intentional lie. Nothing more need be said about this last supposition, for it is too paltry, and has been already

¹ Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 631, says that in the dilemma, “either not dead or not risen,” we are compelled to question rather the reality of the resurrection than that of the death. In his *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 394, he contends that the evidence for the reality of the death—which cannot be with certainty inferred from the execution—lies in the lack of any sufficient proof of his resuscitation. In page 412, he further (like Neander, p. 581, Holtzm. p. 523) insists upon the inconsistency of ascribing to one who had crept half-dead out of the grave, the ability to figure as one who had victoriously risen. Also Renan, *L. J.* 15th ed. p. 444 (and Noack, I. p. 250), believes in the reality of the death: la meilleure garantie c’est la haine soupçonneuse des ennemis. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 56, found the guarantee in the great publicity of the execution. As is well known, Schleierm., p. 456, satisfied himself with the declaration of death in an official way, and yet assumed an apparent death. Detection of apparent death, above, IV. p. 171, n. 2. Pliny, 7, 53.

referred to. By virtue of the two other explanations, Celsus has become the author of the vision-hypothesis, as well as of the phantasm- or reflection-hypothesis. Towards the close of his polemical treatise against the Christians, this passionate critic transforms himself, however, into a believer, at least into a fore-runner of Weisse; and in his contemptuous complaint that the spirit of Jesus appeared only *once*, he himself becomes the most formidable enemy to his own accusation of Christian lies and the play of fancy, in reality to the vision-hypothesis.¹

For many centuries the vision-hypothesis had no success, and it was rejected by Origen himself.² In recent times, it has been in a certain sense held by Spinoza, who found in the narrative of the resurrection this truth: namely, that there came to the disciples in these appearances, which were accommodated to their understandings by the condescending action of God, the knowledge of the spiritual resurrection of Jesus from the dead through the example of his sanctity in life and death.³ But whilst the critics on the Rationalistic side did not hesitate to adopt such an explanation in the case of the vision seen by the Apostle Paul—in which case it is more urgently required—yet as to the life of Jesus it was emphatically rejected by critics from Dr. Paulus and Venturini to Schleiermacher.⁴ Paulus said that

¹ Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 55: Τίς τοῦτο εἶδε; γυνὴ πάροιστρος (according to Mark xvi. 9, or ultimately out of Luke viii. 2), ὡς φατε, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος τῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς γοητείας, ἦτοι κατὰ τινα διάθεσιν ὀνειρώξας ἢ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν δόξῃ πεπλανημένη φαντασιωθείς, ὅπερ ἐν μυρίοις συμβέβηκεν· ἢ, ὅπερ μᾶλλον, κ. τ. λ. (ψεῦσμα, above, p. 325, n. 1). Then 7, 35: ὅψεται τις αὐτοῖς (ἀνθρωποειδεῖς θεοὺς, oracles Trophonius, Amphiaras, Mopsus) οὐχ ἄπαξ παραρρόντας (to sneak in, to appear), ὥσπερ τὸν τούτους ἐξαπατήσαντα, ἀλλ' αἰ τοῖς βουλομένοις ὁμιλοῦντας. In the latter representation there lies, without intention, a criticism of the vision-hypothesis.

² Comp. his polemic against fraud, *Con. Cel.* 2, 56; against the apparition, *ib.* 7, 35.

³ Spinoza, *Epist. XXIII. Henr. Oldenb.*: apparitiones seu revelationes captui et opinionibus eorum hominum accommodatæ, quibus Deus mentem s. iisdem revelare voluit.

⁴ Vision seen by Paul, see Eichhorn and Ammou, in Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 633. Against illusion of fancy, though, according to Lessing, it is as infectious as catarrh, see already Paulus, III. ii. pp. 828 sqq. Venturini, II. ii. pp. 21 sqq. Schleierm. *Christl. Glaube*, II. p. 83; *L. J.* pp. 471, 503.

the most active and most righteous suspicion could find no trace of phantasmal illusion here.¹ Even Strauss, in his earlier "Life of Jesus," introduced the theory of visions only incidentally, alongside of his psychological explanation. He admitted that in the case of several persons, notably of women, pious enthusiasm became so intense as to create visions; but on the whole he preferred to explain the belief in the resurrection in Celsus's second way, that of reflection. The psychological necessity of harmonizing the fact of the Messiah's death with their belief drove the disciples to the Scriptures; they derived from many passages in the Old Testament that higher understanding of the Scriptures which seemed to inspire the latest sayings of Jesus, namely, that it belonged to the vocation of the Messiah to pass through suffering to glory, through the grave to victory over the grave, and to ascension into heaven. From the principle, "He must live!" they now passed involuntarily to the cry, "He lives and he has appeared!"² Such a view, which is essentially the nucleus of Spinoza's conception, has been ultimately advocated by Geiger, Grätz, and Noack.³ This view was in itself doctrinaire, and it certainly explained those observations upon the necessary path through death to life which were subsequently ascribed to Jesus; but it made intelligible neither the early rise of the belief in Jesus's victory over the grave—since it expressly admitted the protracted duration of these reflections—nor its infinite unquestioning joyousness, nor finally that peculiar form of perception in visions which it specially ascribed to the women, while they were attested by the men and the Apos-

¹ Paulus, *l.c.* p. 830.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 634 sqq.

³ Grätz, III. p. 346. Geiger, I. p. 121 (reflection). Noack (unfaithful to his earlier theory, above, p. 326, n. 2) now assumes (II. p. 163) that the oldest Gospels, the Logos Gospel (about A.D. 60) and Luke (about A.D. 70) know nothing of resurrection; this plastic story was first formed by a misunderstanding of John ii. 19 and Hosea vi. 2 (particularly by Mark, A.D. 120—137). Volkmar, pp. 613, 642 sq. (intuition, derived from the Holy Spirit, of Jesus as spiritually risen and exalted to God). In one direction also A. Schweizer, *Christl. Glaube*, II. pp. 222 sq., has the point of view of the perception of Christ without prejudice, whilst at the same time he does not exclude a manifestation of the glorified Jesus. Also Schenkel, p. 324.

ties. Strauss has therefore quite correctly, in his "Reimarus" and since in his "New Life of Jesus," more consistently gone over to the vision-hypothesis. Not so much by the way of reflection, it is now said, as by the quicker road of the heart, of the force of imagination, and of strong nervous excitement, the disciples attained to a belief in the living Messiah: to this process that of reflection, with its soberer developments, was gradually added.¹

At present the vision-theory may be regarded as the most favoured, if not the prevalent, scientific explanation of the obscure proceedings that followed the death of Jesus. Advocated by Renan, Strauss, Réville, and Scholten, it has received fresh support for the life of Jesus from the subtle and detailed application of it to the life of Paul by Dr. Holsten, an application which, though due to the instigations of Baur and Strauss, was nevertheless made before the works of those men. This conclusion was arrived at by the radical theology of Switzerland before Holsten formally stated it.² Even conservative circles do not seem averse to the vision-theory, though with the important proviso that—according to the precedent, or at any rate the verbal expression, of Spinoza—there is to be recognized in the appearances not simply a human projection, but rather a divine objective manifestation in human form.³ The visions mentioned

¹ Strauss, *Reimarus*, 1862, p. 281 (in collected edition of Strauss, V. p. 405): according to our view, the fancy of the disciples, excited by the most profound agitation of soul, represented to them as living again the Master whom they found it impossible to think of as dead. *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 412 sqq., 420 sqq.

² Renan, 15th ed. pp. 448 sq., and more in detail in *Les Apôtres*. Strauss, see above. Réville, *l.c.* Holsten's article on Paul's vision of Christ, in *Hilf. Zeits.* 1861, p. 223. Now reprinted with additions, particularly against Beysschlag, in the work, *Zum Er. des Paul. u. Petr.* 1868, pp. 3 sqq. Also the new essay in the same work, and which in reality only draws the conclusions from the former premisses, *Die Messiasvision des Petr.* pp. 115 sqq. *Zeitstimmen*, 1859, 1861, 1862 sqq.; comp. Gebhardt, pp. 2 sqq.; Biedermann, *Dogmatik*, pp. 520 sqq. E. Langhans, in the *Berner Reformblätter*, laid down as conclusive the vision of faith instead of the vision-hypothesis. Beysschlag: vision of revelation (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 201).

³ Thus, *e.g.*, Ewald (who, in VI. 3rd ed. pp. 75 sqq., speaks of ecstatic seeing, &c.); Schenkel, pp. 322 sqq.; Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 529; Weizs. p. 573; A. Schweizer, II. pp. 222 sq. More in detail below (p. 361).

in the Old and New Testaments, as well as those of ecclesiastical history, as a whole support the possibility that the strong mental agitation into which the disciples were thrown by the unexpected, inconceivable, incredible, and insupportable death of Jesus the Messiah, would, without the incitation of the impression produced by the empty grave, pass over into such states of ravished contemplation of the imperishable, indispensable man, as would be held to be appearances of Jesus himself, and were at once interpreted as the living evidences of a case of resurrection.

A closer examination certainly brings to light a number of circumstances that support this conception. First, there are the immediate characteristics of these occurrences, the mere seeing and being seen, suddenly, momentarily, intermittently, without speech, these appearances extending from individuals to several and then to many, from the most impressionable to the less sensitive, but never—which has always excited suspicion, from Celsus downwards—to unbelievers, to Jews and Gentiles.¹ Even in the Gospels, despite the distinct corporification of this spirit-like appearing and disappearing, there is a dread of the “spirit,” which appears particularly in the night-hours, as well as a difficult recognition or a persistent doubt on the part of

¹ Comp. on the other hand, Rev. xi. 11. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 55: *τίς τοῦτο εἶδε; γυνὴ πάροιςτρος . . .* 2, 63: *ἐχρῶν, εἴπερ ὄντως θείαν δύναμιν ἐκφῆναι, ἢθελεν ὁ I., αὐτοῖς τ. ἐπιηρέασαι καὶ τῷ καταδικάσαντι καὶ ὁλως πᾶσιν ὁφθῆναι.* 2, 67: *οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐπὶ ἐφοβείτο τινα ἀνθρώπων ἀποθανῶν καὶ, ὥς φάτε, θεὸς ὢν. οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἐπέμψθη τὴν ἀρχήν, ἵνα λάθῃ* (according to 2, 68, it would at any rate have been better if he had disappeared straightway from the cross). *Comp.* 2, 35, 73. This objection appears again in Spinoza, *Ep.* XXIII.; Woolston, *Disc.* 6; and in the Fragmentist, pp. 244 sqq., 290 sqq. Already Tert., *Apol.* 21, sought an explanation here: *Nam nec ille se in vulgus eduxit, ne impii errore liberarentur, ut et fides difficultate constaret.* Followed by Lact. 4, 20 (19: *nihil videntibus*). On the other hand, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 67, held it rather for a *φειδῆσθαι, ἵνα μὴ ταταχθῶσιν ἀποασίῃ* (comp. the people of Sodom). He afterwards gives the spiritualistic exposition of *ἰδεῖν κατὰ δύναμιν*. Later literature, in Hase, p. 272. The Rationalists held that sickness and danger led to the retirement (Paulus, Schleierm.), since Jesus might otherwise have been again executed (Winer). Others have thought of a desire to guard against materialistic Messianism (Neander), against futile conflicts of the people with the hierarchy and the Romans (Hase, 3rd ed. p. 211). The appearances were a confirmation of faith (Neander, p. 584; Steinm. p. 15) without miracle (Güder, pp. 42 sqq.); and incorporeal (Spinoza, *Ep.* XXIII., and Schenkel, p. 324).

several.¹ Finally, there is the fact upon which Strauss, Weisse, Schenkel, and Holsten have laid special stress, namely, that these appearances are expressly placed in the same category as the later appearance to Paul, at least in his own narration, a fact which gives fuller scope to the vision-hypothesis, inasmuch as it is impossible to think of Jesus as being still upon earth at the time of the appearance to Paul, and as moreover it is beyond doubt that Paul possessed the faculty of seeing visions.² The appearances to Paul bring us face to face with quite a fresh kind of evidence. The whole history of the apostolic time is rich in appearances due to excited nerves: it is full of visions and ecstasies. The Jewish-Christian opponents of Paul boast of their visions and revelations of the Lord; but Paul does so no less. Once, whether in the body or out of the body he knew not, he was caught up into the third heaven, into Paradise, where he heard unspeakable words. At another time he heard words spoken by Jesus; and at another, indeed the first time, he only saw the Lord's glorified form.³ Or he speaks in general terms of inward and outward divine revelations concerning the nature of Christian doctrine, the glory of the Christian future, as well as concerning journeys and courses of action for the pacification of dissensions.⁴ He also refers copiously to a kind of divine worship which was very popular in all Christian churches, and which he himself practised with virtuosity, namely, that of speaking with tongues, which according to his clear description was an unconscious or half-unconscious glorification of God, his

¹ Matt. xxviii. 17; Luke xxiv. 16—31, 37 sqq.; John xx. 15 sqq. In a different manner the appendix to Mark, xvi. 11 sqq., harshly describes the unbelief of the apostles.

² 1 Cor. xv. 5—8, comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 134. It is by no means therefore necessary, with Strauss (*New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 417) and others, to make him an epileptic.

³ 2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq., 8 sqq.; 1 Cor. ix. 1. Belief in a heavenly Paradise, in from two to seven heavens, among the Jews, comp. *Bava Mezia*, f. 89: in a controversy of God in the academia cœlestis, Rabbi Barnahaman was called as referee. Eadem hora anima ejus rapta est in cœlum et sua sententia Dei judicium approbavit. Wetst. II. p. 210. Comp. above, IV. pp. 284, 288; VI. p. 157.

⁴ 1 Cor. ii. 6—16, vii. 40, &c.; Galat. ii. 2.

salvation, and the future, with a loud voice and in more or less inarticulate and unintelligible sounds, a phenomenon frequent among enthusiastic communities.¹ A little later than Paul stands the man of the Revelation, John, who, on the resurrection-day of Jesus at Easter, A.D. 69, saw in spirit the glorified form of Jesus and the occurrences which were to take place in heaven and earth until the second advent of Jesus.²

The Acts of the Apostles attests these appearances seen by pious enthusiasm. It knows of visions seen by Peter and Paul, by Philip and Stephen, by the Damascene Ananias and the centurion Cornelius; it knows of miraculous revelations of the Spirit, and of many cases in which believers suddenly speak by the Spirit and with tongues.³ These incidents, the full force of which we do not feel until we have made a detailed examination of the apostolic period, produce a somewhat overpowering impression.⁴ It is clear and evident that whilst Paul and Peter and James exhibited a sober habit of contemplation, extravagance nevertheless prevailed at the same time: might not this stand in connection, as an inheritance, with the primitive underlying facts in the construction of this community?⁵ To this it cannot be objected—as we now so often hear—that the Jews and the Christians of the apostolic age, Paul included, sharply distinguished between facts of vision and facts of external reality, and in particular between the later visions and the things that were observed immediately after the death of Jesus, reckoning but a small and definite number of the latter, but many of the

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 1 sqq. Comp. my detailed exposition of speaking with tongues, in *Herzog*, XVIII. pp. 676 sqq.

² Rev. i. 9 sqq.

³ Acts ii. 1 sqq., vii. 55 sqq., viii. 26 sqq., x. 3 sqq., 10 sqq., 19 sqq., 30 sqq. Paul, his companions, and Ananias, ix. 1 sqq. (comp. xxii. 6 sqq., xxvi. 12 sqq.); xiii. 2, xvi. 6 sqq., xviii. 9 sqq., xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23 sq. Comp. also xi. 23, xx. 23, xxi. 10 sqq. Finally, x. 44 sqq., xix. 6 (comp. ii. 1 sqq).

⁴ My *Gesch. Chr.* p. 136, is hereby qualified.

⁵ A division of the mental phenomena into ecstatic and sober elements, with the preponderance of the latter, is by no means excluded; comp. Lang, *Zeitstimmen*, IV. p. 203; Réville, p. 15.

former.¹ On the contrary, both in the Old Testament and to Paul, that which was seen in visions passed as reality, and not merely as non-material mental reality, but as something sensibly-perceptible yet super-material, and which sometimes descended to a man upon earth, and at others was manifested to him when caught up into heaven. Though Paul might on his own part distinguish the super-material which he saw in a vision of the night, or with his eyes by day, or with his spirit when transported out of his body into heaven, who can guarantee the specific difference of what was perceived, and who does not detect the mistake when Paul postulates, for the processes of his own inner life, a real transference to heaven, a sort of preliminary ascension? Can we establish a remote possibility that what was seen by the eye on the journey to Damascus had a firmer, more objective, more materially real ground, than what was seen in his ascension to heaven or in the visions of the night?² The specific distinction of the resurrection-vision in contrast to the later visions follows to a large extent naturally, not merely from a peculiar character in the appearance—which perhaps was of the same kind, at any rate bore the same name—but rather from the relation of earlier and later, of original and derived, of indescribable first impression and of repetition of that impression,

¹ Thus Güder, pp. 34 sqq.; Gebhardt, pp. 31 sqq.; Pressensé, p. 663; Riggenb. *Vortrag in der ev. Allianz*, 1867, p. 13; Steinm. p. 141. Particularly Beyschlag, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, pp. 201 sqq., with an appeal to Num. xii. 6 sqq., 1 Kings xxii. 17, Acts x. 17, xii. 9, with which Krauss is satisfied, as if the passages in the Acts did not themselves show the confusion, and as if that confusion was not inherent in the nature of visions, according to J. Müller's *Physiol.* II. pp. 563 sqq., which Krauss himself quotes, p. 273. On the contrary, Holsten, pp. 11 sqq.; also Bunsen, p. 431.

² It is remarkable that apologists have made no use of an observation which places in a new light the relatively sober gift of distinguishing visions possessed by Paul, the observation, namely, that, notwithstanding his belief in the words of Jesus which he had heard in ecstasies and visions (2 Cor. xii. 9), he never employs such words in his statements of Christian doctrine, but simply the historically spoken words of Jesus, 1 Cor. vii. 10, comp. ix. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15. How easy it would have been for him to base upon such words his doctrine of the Law, of the admission of the Gentiles! It is true that a proof would not be thereby established; but the fact shows that we must be careful not to push the theory of the visionary character of the Apostle too far.

of connection with the fresh death-mystery of Jesus or with his later glory in heaven.

This theory is very much strengthened by the obvious difficulty of conceiving of a corporeal resurrection. In the first place, we cannot understand what this supplement to the terrestrial intercourse of Jesus with his disciples is really intended to signify. We could understand that Jesus, in transitory appearances, such as are the best attested, might wish to furnish to the disciples, whose spirits and faith were crushed, an evidence that he was still living; but this repeated—though again, it is said, for pedagogic reasons interrupted—fellowship of long meetings and long conversations, such as the Gospels are fond of describing, cannot possibly be admitted in the face of the fact that Jesus had never stimulated the disciples with a hope of his resurrection and of the completion of their instructions after that event, but on the contrary had finished his work with as much care as the head of a household, had taken a painful farewell, and had fixed the prospect of a reunion in the time of his return at a distant future.¹ It is yet more difficult to make this corporeal resurrection harmonize with our general knowledge of the course and nature of human life. Resurrections, dead men appearing upon the earth, are to be found only in mythical stories.² Painful as may be to many the deeply wounding resolve to forsake the Jewish point of view of an expectation of terrestrial bliss, yet even the future hope of Christians must renounce the terrestrial resurrection of the body if the continued life and development of the disembodied spirits are not to suffer an endless suspension. That Jesus by his sinlessness was made an exception to the general rule, is a proposition finding but poor support in that sinlessness, since that sinlessness must, according to Jewish-Christian dogmatic, have in the first instance

¹ Matt. xxvi. 29; Luke xxii. 15.

² Comp. Diod. 13, 86; Pliny, *Ep.* 7, 21; Jos. *Ant.* 17, 13, 4; *B. J.* 7, 6, 3; Eus. 6, 5, &c. Also Matt. xiv. 2.

prevented death, and not have subsequently brought about a resurrection, since further human nature apart from sin appears destined by natural law, if not to *this* form of death, at least to the successive appearance and disappearance of generations, to the silent yielding of the individuals to death. But if we assume Jesus to have exhibited an exception to the general rule, how are we to think of his resurrection?¹ As a most remarkable conversion of the gross body into a subtile one, so that the gross elements of the flesh, even the bones, indeed even the grave clothes—for Luke and John are the first to find them still in the grave—disappeared, were transfigured and converted into the higher corporeity?² Or as a capricious alternation between a subtile and a gross corporeity, which is self-contradictory, though its assumption by the Gospels is as distinct as it is untenable; or, more correctly, as a victorious marching up and down the earth with a subtile corporeity subservient in part to the earth and in part to heaven, which however would be adapted neither to the organization of the gross earth corresponding to gross bodies, nor again, so far as it was of terrestrial nature, to the celestial destiny of this body?³ And where was his spirit meanwhile, before by the power of God or by his own he rose again,—was it on the earth, in heaven, or in hell, as the

¹ Even Hase, p. 278, still holds that the body of Jesus could not be subdued by death, which is unnatural except as a consequence of sin. Comp. Steinm., above, p. 169, n. 2.

² Comp. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 3, 42; 6, 72. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 622. Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 532. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 295. Ignat., *Smyrn.* 3, already felt the difficulties.

³ Paulus, Winer, Schleierm., Lücke, Theile, and others thought of a restoration of the former corporeity; the Fathers and the Reformers, also Olshausen and Krabbe, of a completely glorified nature; Tholuck and Bleek, of a progressive glorification. Comp. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 62: *ὡς περὶ ἐν μεθορίῳ*. Influenced by Rothe (transitory body), Steinm. (pp. 113—121) thought of a condescension of the spiritual Christ to the laws of visibility. The material corporeity in the Gospels, accommodation, Krabbe, pp. 527 sq., for which we can appeal to Gen. xviii. 8, opp. Judges xiii. 16. Complete bewilderment, Neander, p. 596, Krauss, p. 315. The contradictions which Krauss would deny, Strauss, Schenkel, Holtzm., and A. Schweizer (II. p. 211) lay stress upon. Biedermann explains them by finding that the aim was simply to prove objectivity.

Church early believed and the Gospel of Nicodemus states?¹ And, to pass by the general questions about soul and body, how could this departed spirit force itself again into the disused organism which for twenty-four hours had been exposed to all the consequences of death, except according to the crude Jewish suppositions that a change did not take place in the body until the third day, and that the soul hovered in the neighbourhood of its body for three days?² From all these embarrassments we are delivered by the vision-hypothesis, and particularly by the recognition of the fact that it was simply the impossible, materialistic, Jewish, primarily Persian-Gentile dogmatic of the resurrection-doctrine, afterwards inherited by primitive Christianity, that created the picture of the risen Jesus, and that transformed the still intelligible cry, "The Lord lives, the Lord has revived, we have seen the Lord!" into the dogma, "The Lord has risen with his body out of the grave."

But after all, with all these supports to the modern theory, was it really possible for the Apostles, in their situation, to arrive at this revulsion, this escape, this glad belief that Jesus lived, this ecstatic view of the dead as living? A unanimous cry of "Impossible!" here comes from the opponents of the theory, even from Weisse and Fichte, Holtzmann and Weizsäcker:

¹ On earth, according to the Jewish view, see above, p. 299, n. 4; in heaven, according to the sublime Jewish doctrine of the chosen in Paradise, comp. Esdras, see above, IV. pp. 284 sqq.; in Hades, according to Rom. x. 7; Acts ii. 27; Eph. iv. 9; 1 Peter iii. 18 sqq.; Rev. vi. 9; *Ev. Nicod., Test. XII. Patr. Benj.* 9; and the Fathers of the second century, comp. above, p. 179, n. 1. I here differ entirely from the exegetical conclusions of my respected colleague A. Schweizer, in his work on the Descent into Hell, 1868. According to Gess, pp. 196 sq., the spirit of Jesus, after a brief syncope of death, went to God on the same day. According to Steinm., p. 37, he was not unconscious, though powerless; but after the resurrection he remained forty days upon the earth, not, however, as Hengst. thinks, praying upon the hills; we do not know where (pp. 37, 125).

² *Acta Pil. A.* 14: ἡ ψυχὴ δὲ πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ σῶμα? Jews, above, p. 299, n. 4. By this I do not intend to subscribe to the sallies of Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 625 sq., against the popular dualism of body and soul, which in a certain sense is ever recurring even on monistic, though not on materialistic, ground. The comparisons—bird and cage, box and contents—are, although readily repeated by others, the more inappropriate because such a truly Philonic dualism belongs to neither the popular nor the Christian view.

the Apostles, in their dejection, in their hopelessness, in their utter mental paralysis, could not possibly, without higher help, have risen to such a triumphant faith and sight, assertion and action.¹ Even Strauss acknowledges that the conversion of Paul and the formation of the picture of the living glorified Christ before his eyes could be much more easily brought about as after-products of the already existing picture, of the already attested life, than could the first production in the Apostles of the visionary picture of Jesus as living again after the annihilation of his being and of his cause.²

But these difficulties must not be exaggerated, either as to Paul or as to the Apostles.³ Fichte has recently sought to distinguish between visions and visions, between such as are and such as are not explicable from the mental conditions of those who see them; and the visions of the resurrection are reckoned by him among the latter.⁴ In reality, however, these

¹ Comp. Neander, pp. 577 sqq.: expectation utterly defeated, no intermediate link, vision without any psychological antecedent. Bleek, II. p. 458. Krabbe, pp. 524 sq. Güder, pp. 24, 26. Luthardt, *Mod. Darstell.* p. 22. Gebhardt, pp. 11 sqq. Pressensé, p. 645. Krauss, p. 299. Godet, p. 20. Steinm. p. 136. But even Weisse, II. pp. 309, 428. Fichte, see below, n. 4. Weizsäcker, pp. 569 sqq. Holtzm. *Gesch. Isr.* p. 532. Weisz. surpasses himself in positive assertions: it is impossible (p. 572); it will never succeed (p. 573)! This assertion with reference to the disposition of the Apostles finds parallels in others with reference to that of Paul, see below, n. 3.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 635 sq. Krabbe, p. 525, and Gebhardt, p. 24, had also laid stress upon this.

³ Beyschlag, 1864, p. 244, with unusual emphasis, and many others (comp. only Krauss, p. 289, Riegenb. 1867, p. 13), assert that one who was out-and-out a Jew, an absolutely unmitigated opponent of Christianity (according to Gal. i. 13 sqq.), would be neither prepared nor predisposed to have a vision of Christ, unless it came upon him as an objective influence. As if it were allowable to think a Paul in his spiritual conflict with the Christians was such a bungler, so little of a Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 7 sqq.); as if in the midst of this, which was only a *forced* struggle, Paul had not already become half a captive of the persecuted faith by the inner dissatisfaction with the Law which had long begun in him (Rom. vii.), by his belief in spirits and in resurrection (Acts xxiii. 7), finally by the influence of the Christians and by their appeal to the returning Messiah. Comp. Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 418 sqq. Holsten, pp. 46 sqq. Even Steinm., p. 141, admits at least the possibility of such a vision. Paul's dissatisfaction with the Law has not before been referred to.

⁴ Fichte, *Vermischte Schriften*, II. pp. 120 sqq. (Leipsic, 1869). Comp. Joh. Huber, *Philos. Probleme*, in *A. A. Zeitung*, June, 1869.

latter belong to the most easily explicable. For we have here simply an illustration of the principle, that what the heart is full of, the mouth and the eye overflow with.¹ It is true that the disciples by no means expected the resurrection of Jesus, particularly since he had not foretold it; and therefore the assertions in the apocryphal books are erroneous, that the mother of Jesus or that his brother James consoled themselves with the hope of his resuscitation.² Nor did those common meals actually take place in which Jesus is said by the Gospels to have participated.³ The condition of the disciples has been most correctly described by the editor of Mark: "They mourned and wept."⁴ They will also have fasted, as was foretold by an utterance of Jesus himself, and as James the brother is actually said to have done.⁵ But is sorrow merely an unbending, and not also force and passion, resistance and struggle with a fate brought about by the unjust and the impossible? We should have but a paltry conception of the dominating influence of the personality of Jesus upon the disciples—who at any rate did not totally fall away from him—and of their attachment to him, if we did not at once admit what individual accounts give, and what even the deniers of the psychological explanation incidentally admit, namely, that in the midst of the lamentation and of the disillusion, the picture of the living, the indispensable, the invincible Jesus hovered before them, most vividly of all in the very first days, and that they now dwelt sweetly upon this sight, now impetuously demanded him again,

¹ Luke xxiv. 32; Acts iv. 20. In so far Krauss's (pp. 274 sqq.) strained effort to prove that visions suppose nothing new is quite bootless; it is in harmony with the above.

² Luke xxiv. 21 proves the opposite of hope on the third day. On the contrary, *Ev. Hebr.* ap. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2, see above, p. 321, n. 1; and *Acta Pil.* B. c. 11.

³ Luke xxiv. 30, 42; Acts x. 41; John xxi. 12; comp. *Ev. Hebr.*, above, p. 321, n. 1.

⁴ Mark xvi. 10, comp. John xvi. 20.

⁵ Matt. ix. 15. James, see above, p. 321, n. 1.

and now hopefully prayed and longed for him.¹ When many lesser lives end, faith and love day by day throw doubt upon the fact of death, would if they could bring back life, and straightway dream of appearances and signs even when such do not occur. After the death of Rabbi Judas the Holy, in Sephoris near Nazara, the citizens of that place swore: "Whoever shall say to us that the Rabbi is dead, we will put him to death!" And after the death of Mohammed, Abubekr and Omar prepared the sword for the heads of those who denied that the Prophet lived. Of Aristeas, the ancient Greek poet and a man of miraculous adventures, it is related not merely that the civic announcement of his death was strongly denied in the neighbouring district where he had been seen and spoken with, but also that he was not to be found either alive or dead in the house where he died.²

With Jesus it is said to have happened very differently. His

¹ Luke xxiv. 19. Even Neander, p. 578, Pressensé, p. 645, Gebh. pp. 13 sqq., and others, must admit that the disciples' love and even their faith (in the prophets, nay, in the Messiah) could not pass away, that the picture of Jesus must present itself to them; only these critics usually add that the latter was brought about by time and could not have taken place at once (on the contrary, Holsten here says, p. 234, that the vision is the most conceivable at the time of the first profound agitation). Weizs., p. 569, contradicts himself very strongly: it cannot be asserted that the deep dejection prevented a reaction. On the contrary, the disciples must (by the powerful influence of the life of Jesus and by the prediction of his continued life in heaven) have been thrown into an agitation in which they could undertake the boldest things, at any rate were more than ever accessible to an impulse to enthusiastic elevation. On the other hand, everything goes to show that they were not prepared for an immediate re-appearance of Jesus. I should think the premisses here would lead to Holsten. The causes of the elevation of mind in the disciples are given in particular also by Schenkel, p. 323. Even Steinm., pp. 14 sq., is inclined to see a germ of truth in the vision-hypothesis; *faith co-operated*.

² As examples may be taken Saul and Samuel, 1 Sam. xxviii. 11; Antipas and John, Matt. xiv. 2; the Sepphorites and Judas the Ho'y, *Hier. Kilaim*. f. 32, c. 2, Lightfoot, p. 229; the followers of Dositheus, who asserted that their master was not dead, *Hilg. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 373; Aristeas of Proconnesus (to whom the Neo-Platonists appealed, *Ens. c. Hier.* 2), Herodotus, 4, 14, Pliny, *II. Nat.* 7, 53; Apollonius of Tyana, Philost. 8, 31, Vopisc. *Aurelian.* 24; the adherents of Mohammed, particularly Abubekr and Omar, who swore to cut off the head of any one that would assert the prophet was no more, see Nöldeke's article *Muhammed*, in *Herzog*, XVIII. p. 797, and Holtzm. *Gesch. Isr.* II. p. 525.

personal character, his prerogative of the Messiah in whom the disciples, though they had fled, the women under the cross and with Joseph at the grave, believed, the remembrance of *his* presentiment of heavenly glory—all this is alleged to have produced no movement of soul which ascribed life to the man, the Messiah, who no longer was and nevertheless still was, who could not die to himself and to them and to God and to the world.¹ In reality he was not dead to them: not to the women under the cross; still less to the Apostles, since they had seen him only as living, as strong to the last moment, since they had not witnessed his passion, his disgrace, his dying, his burial, since finally they, in Galilee, far from the disasters and the graves of Jerusalem, stood again entirely upon his ground and theirs, upon the ground of his successes, of his strength, of his triumphs, and in the bond of love and fellowship with which they afresh bound themselves together and which they evidently extended to the family of Jesus, they plainly revealed the continued life and the continued rule of the Master in his community.² In such a flood of unbounded excitement, intensified by abstention from food and by the feverish moods of evening, it is quite in harmony with experience that the boundaries of the inner and the outer world should disappear. Eye and ear become sympathetic instruments of the inner surging mental world; and in the performance of their external service, with a strange adjustment and blending of the double function, present to the man as external what, in fact, he has only internally seen and heard.³ Thus, in both

¹ Comp. Holsten, p. 231. Krauss repeatedly charges the vision-view with reasoning in a circle: the vision seen by Paul is proved by those seen by the twelve, the latter by that seen by Paul (p. 298), and what is still weightier, a restoration of the annihilated belief in the Messiah by means of visions is spoken of, and yet again the belief is held to precede the visions. The very intelligible dialectic of belief and unbelief *uno eodemque momento* is overlooked in this abstractly formal objection.

² Krauss says, infelicitously, p. 303: by the transference of the visions to Galilee, the natural explanation loses its last support; the exaltation must have ended or at least have become weakened in the accustomed and friendly surroundings.

³ Literature: Joh. Müller, *Ueber die phant. Gesichterscheiunungen*, 1826; his *Lehrbuch der Phys.* 4th ed. II. pp. 563 sqq.; Ideler, *Seelenheilkunde*, II. p. 427; *Gerichtl.*

ancient and modern times, over-excited nerves and congestive conditions, temporary or chronic morbid states of the sensorium, have given rise to visions; thus, not to speak of the Old and New Testaments with their long lists of examples, Maximilla and the Montanists saw Christ, the Maid of Orleans received the archangel Michael and SS. Catherine and Margaret, Francis of Assisi saw the Lord as a seraph, and Savonarola looked upon both obscure and clear pictures of the future through the ministry of angels. In the same way, the eccentric Mohammed, the pious Swendenborg, the illuminated bookseller Nicolai, have had visions. Paganism, enthusiastic in its fresh faith or in its struggle with unbelief and with Christianity, has seen its gods; the longing youth and the conscience-troubled emperor Aurelian saw the prophet Apollonius of Tyana.¹ How much more readily would such seeing and hearing and the belief in it arise among the Jews, where the supernatural was looked for everywhere, even in dreams of the night and in the delirium of sickness; where a glance from above was seen in every refraction of light, a *bat kol*, a voice of God, was heard in every movement of the air; where, finally, as was early said in so noteworthy a manner by Tacitus, even the executed did not doubt the immortality of

Psych. p. 243; *Theorie des rel. Wahnsinns*, I. p. 30; Lotze, *Medicin. Psych.* p. 489; Hecker, lecture on Visions, 1848; H. Meyer, lecture on Illusions, in *Virchow u. Holtzendorf*, 7; Rosenkranz, *Psych.* 3rd ed. pp. 185 sqq. See Holsten, p. 79, and Krauss (with valuable quotations), pp. 268 sqq. From these works it follows that we must not exaggerate the morbid character of the visions, with Beyschlag or Krauss, who, however, quite correctly deprecate the "shattered-nerved epileptic" into which Paul is sometimes converted. Of a somewhat morbid nature is also the temporary over-excitement produced by strong emotion, and not merely the chronic excitement with its perennial foundation of physical infirmity, as in Mohammed, Joan of Arc, or Nicolai. The important influence of fasting is shown by Joh. Müller, *Phant. Ges.* p. 66, and (in Joan of Arc) Hase, *New Proph.* pp. 88 sq.; but see already Dan. x. 1 sqq.; 4 Esdras 9, 24; Acts x. 1 sqq.; *Past. Herm.* Vis. 3, 10; and the very common Rabb. sentence, *taanit chalom, jejunium pro insomnio*, Lightfoot, p. 309. Comp. the Essenes, above, I. pp. 376 sqq. Hilg. *Apokalyptik*, p. 253. Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 428. Holsten, pp. 231 sqq.

¹ Maximilla, Eus. 5, 16. The youth, Philost. 8, 31. Aurelian, Vopisc. *Aur.* 24 (two very instructive examples, since the psychological premisses are plainly present). Min. Felix, *Octav.* 7: *etiam per quietem deos videmus, audimus, agnoscimus, quos impie per diem negamus, nolumus, pejeramus.* Also comp. Hase and Krauss, *l.c.*

the soul, and, like the disciples themselves, spoke day by day of spirits and of the risen!¹ And though we find a satisfaction in regarding it as a mark of the real and immaculate greatness of Jesus that he, although an Oriental, was of a most sober mind, did not base his vocation and his work upon visions and disconnected external revelations, and did not nourish his disciples with visions, although the mythical parts of the Gospels several times allude to such visions; we do not thereby actually prove that this spirit of the life of Jesus and of his training of the disciples for ever made it impossible for the disciples to have visions, particularly in view of the extraordinary character of their situation and of the so easily moved, exalted, enthusiastic idiosyncrasy of the Galileans, of Peter, to say nothing here of Magdalene.²

It is therefore conceivable that first and foremost Peter, the confidant of Jesus, the disciple who was at once an enthusiast and a man of vigorous will, the man who in the fullest degree bore the living Jesus in his soul because he had before all the others recognized, longed for and loved the Messiah, and as an irrepressible adherent had experienced everything down to Gethsemane, to Jerusalem, to Galilee, down to yesterday and to-day in the sting of his denial,—it is conceivable that he, first and foremost, should believe he had seen alive with his own eyes the Lord who had not for a moment ceased to be the sanctifying and chastening dominant power in his mind and conscience, and who now came in spirit to Galilee in order—according to a

¹ Comp. A. Schweizer, p. 218. Ecstasies (itnegid, that is, rapi in ecstasin), even in sickness, Bux. p. 1292. Wetst. p. 453. On the bat kol (comp. John xii. 28 sqq.), Lightfoot, pp. 147, 275; Schöttg. p. 190. As example, may be added the burial of the above-named R. Judas. Among the miracles on his burial-day there happened this: bat kol beatitudinem (Cath. indulgence) eum plangentibus pronunciavit. Lightfoot, p. 229. Immortality, Tac. *Hist.* 5, 5: animas prælio aut suppliciis peremtorum æternas putant. Spirits, Matt. xiv. 26; Luke xxiv. 37 sqq.; Acts xii. 15, xxiii. 9. The risen, Matt. xiv. 2, xvi. 14.

² When Weizsäcker (like Renan), on the ground of Mark i. 10, Matt. xvii. 3, repeatedly assumes visionary practices in the circle of Jesus (again, p. 573), his own logical conclusion is the vision-hypothesis. To excess Noack makes Jesus a visionary. Of Magdalene, who gave the world a God, Renan (after Celsus) has spoken, and she has also given Strauss much to think about.

passage in Lactantius—to seek his Apostles. If Peter believed, then the way to faith and vision stood open for the twelve, even for the five hundred; and Jesus's commission would fulfil itself in a new way: "When thou returnest, confirm the others."¹ The vivid emotions of human nature have a wonderful power of diffusion. Laughter and tears, depression and enthusiasm, even demoniacal possession, are, by their natural force and by the suspension of the action of the calm mental powers, decidedly contagious and communicable to the spectator,—contagious as the catarrh, says Lessing in his way.² Religious enthusiasm and ecstasy have a double power of diffusion, because the strength of natural affinity is doubled by the mental alliance and the sympathetic fundamental disposition even of non-participants. The Old and New Testaments show the transference of the prophetic gift, of speaking with tongues, even to neutrals.³ The accounts of the Montanists, the Flagellants, the Anabaptists and Quakers, the Camisards and Appellants, the Methodists and Irvingites, no one wishes to deny. The excitement ran from one to another, from several to the masses; and the Montanists infected even the heathens with their visions of the heavenly Jerusalem.⁴ Of course exceptions are not wanting, as in the visions of Apollonius, when the gazing youth contentedly answered the question of the others, "Where is he then? we see him nowhere," with the words, "It seems that he is come only to

¹ Luke xxii. 32. Lact. 4, 19: ut discipulos suos quæreret.

² Comp. Paulus, III. ii. pp. 828 sqq. Particularly Hecker on visions, p. 31. Renan, *Apostel*, p. 16. Réville, pp. 14 sqq. Hase, *L. J.* p. 273. Krauss, p. 305, who again merely consoles himself with the reflection—which proves nothing—that in all examples of contagious visions, the object of the vision is nothing essentially new, but only something that has been already present in the minds of the infected. Godet, pp. 24 sq., quite incorrectly says that such conditions do not easily become epidemic.

³ 1 Sam. x. 5 sq., 10—12; 1 Cor. xiv. 1 sqq.; Acts ii. 1 sqq., xix. 6. That strangers, 1 Cor. xiv. 23, are not at once infected, is no proof to the contrary; comp. also xiv. 25.

⁴ Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 3, 24. Krauss, p. 305, exhibits considerable obtuseness when he says that the last-mentioned infection, by the intercourse of heathens with Christians, is conceivable, but that of Christians by Christians is not.

me!"¹ In the Reformation period, Wolfgang Rychard of Ulm, a physician as profound as he was Christian, when writing of the mysterious popular movement which was set on foot in 1519 at Regensburg by Balthasar Hubmeier, the Friedberger (Pacimontanus), subsequently a Baptist, spoke of a contagion of paroxysms of melancholy.² When Peter announced to his fellow-disciples, "I have seen the Lord!" a repetition of this vision-seeing might, in minds of similar though weaker fundamental character, be quickly developed out of faith and even out of doubt. But from the twelve, who bore witness to the Lord with one mind and spirit, it was carried over to the five hundred by the influence of a great assembly, perhaps in the night, and even intensified by the resistance of doubt. The sober and retiring James, the truthful Thomas, at last overcome, would attach themselves to the community of Him whom in life they had misunderstood. Even the gradual but daring transition from beholding to heroic testimony is not altogether inconceivable. The conviction was welcome, the Messianism of Jesus was divinely proved, the exalted joy after the profound sorrow powerfully prepared the way for act and word, the indignant anger against Israel was consistently followed by a severe preaching of repentance. The modest scholars could and must become teachers, since after the departure of the head, the saviours of his name, of his honour, of his cause, must be found among the members.³

The weighty objections which the Church is accustomed to bring against this explanation, are in many ways exaggerated.⁴

¹ Philost. 8, 31.

² Wölg. Rychard, according to his letters described by me in *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 317.

³ See particularly Acts iv. 19 sq. It is possible that the progress was gradual, that the disciples first returned to Jerusalem, but that their lingering timidity (Acts i. 12 sqq.) prevented them from bearing testimony until the outbreak of the gift of tongues (Glossolaly), Acts ii. 1 sqq.

⁴ Enough has been said by Beyschlag, Luthardt, Güder, and others, of the wantonness of mere lust of negation, as well as of the explanation of Christianity as the outcome of cozening and fraud. Comp. on the other hand, Holsten, p. 8. Also Biedermann, pp. 525 sq.

A purely historical investigation might ignore these objections, which have their rise in a very different ground; it can attempt to answer them because it seeks to serve the Church. It is said that, if the vision-hypothesis be true, Christianity rests with the deepest roots of its existence upon self-deception and powerful fanatical error; and that it thus renounces, upon the final decisive point, the claim to a supernatural character of its origin.¹ The first charge is plainly incorrect. For the faith of Peter and his colleagues rested primarily, not upon the resurrection of Jesus, but upon the general impression of his personality; and even beneath that self-deception, by which the faith of the disciples was restored—nay, by which, according to the permission and will of God, it was so re-constructed as to be in the completest harmony with their time, their mental idiosyncrasy, and their force of will—there lay, as a foundation of noble imperishable gold, the pure and strong impression they had felt in his presence: hence Langhans of Berne has not incorrectly spoken of a faith-hypothesis instead of a vision-hypothesis. The second charge is in part to be admitted, but it is at the same time deprived of its force by the fact that the loss of the supernatural is balanced by an increase of conviction concerning the genuinely human character of the whole life of the Lord. The supernatural, however, is not altogether lost, even when it disappears in its old forms. The dignity and sublimity of Jesus are heightened if, merely by the impression of his life without any sign from heaven, he was able to counteract even in Jewish minds the impression of his cross, of his destruction; and in proportion as his unique dignity is heightened, in the same proportion there remains open the explanation of a creative issue of this extraordinary and even superhuman life, without the miracles of a supernatural birth and a resurrection.² Further, that supernatural element which we by anticipation call the

¹ Thus even Hase, p. 269. Weisse, II. pp. 427 sq., and Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 296.

² Similar remarks in Schenkel, *l.c.*

super-terrestrial glory of Jesus, the guarantee of higher eternal life for mankind, does not disappear with the falling away of the terrestrial resurrection of Jesus, which resurrection, as a merely solitary and unrepeatable occurrence, has in reality no assuring force; for a firmer basis than this contradicted sign is his teaching, his undoubting belief in and his sure and consolatory reliance upon a future for himself and for his own, whose hope stands firmly based upon the divine voice in their spirit, and sealed by the divine words and the fearless heroic death of their exalted Master.

Yet, notwithstanding all these arguments in favour of the vision-theory, it is by no means the writer's intention to adopt that theory. Impartiality and the love of truth must permit the use of language which seems to be inspired by sympathy with a rejected view, while it is only the expression of a spirit of fairness and of a longing to find a way to a solution. In these lines it may be detected that the writer, quite indifferent to what he himself formerly said, has attempted from first to last to keep to the path of independent investigation.¹ In this sense it has here been attempted to cut the Gordian knot by the aid of the view held by many contemporaries, in the spirit of a friend to give emphasis to the arguments supporting that view, and either implicitly or explicitly to turn away many of the objections adduced by the still numerous opponents. But other objections remain that are not so easily disposed of; they are not exactly those which are most frequently heard upon this battle-field of the critics, but they are objections of sufficient weight to throw the strongest doubts upon or even entirely to overthrow the explanation which is at present most popular.² They are based upon that very account by the Apostle

¹ I shall not be disquieted if the sections of my *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 131 sqq., 179 sqq., are quoted against me. Yet the reader of pp. 132—135 will still more probably not overlook the identity of the final conclusions.

² The usual grounds are: objectivity of the appearance to Paul, impossibility of a vision seen by 500, the exhibition of doubt (Güder, p. 35; Godet, p. 21), particularly by a Thomas (Krabbe, p. 525), the systematic gradation of the utterances (Gess,

Paul which is the only firm foundation of the whole question; the same Paul, therefore, who seemed so incontrovertibly to guarantee the hypothesis, imperils its very existence.

In the first place, namely, too much is not to be made of the weight of the facts of the apostolic time, which is full of more or less self-generated human visions. For side by side with the vision-standpoint, there is still more of calm consideration and sober reflection to be seen in the action of all the Apostles, and most conspicuously in the friction between the Pauline and the Jewish-Christian missions. And when the defenders of the vision-theory allow this calm consideration to be already operative in the controversies between Stephen and the Jews, and between the adherents of Stephen and their persecutor Saul, the Paul of the subsequent history, they cannot well explain how the violent agitation of men's minds—which discharged itself in visions, and by visions created for Christianity its first expression, its first confession—so very soon afterwards found its completion or indeed its termination in conditions marked by clearness and soberness of mind. This exposition, already made elsewhere and illustrated in detail by a comparison between the primitive Apostles and Paul, has not been, at present at least, refuted.¹ Of still more weight is the observation that an immediate connection between the visions after the death of Jesus and later

pp. 197 sqq.), the crushed condition of the disciples, the lack of a Jewish expectation of the resurrection of the Messiah (Gebhardt, p. 14), the necessity of doubt when the visions ended (even Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 296).

¹ Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 135. Agreement of Godet, pp. 25, 35. Heer, p. 122. This calm consideration in the days of Stephen, A.D. 36, admitted, e.g. by H. Hirzel in his discourse on the Apostle Paul, 1864. A remarkable indication of this sober separation of the historical and the visionary even by the Apostle Paul, above, p. 338, n. 2. This is further capable of the generalization that, namely, Paul, despite the ἀποκάλυψις πνεύματος (Gal. i. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 10), had already in A.D. 39, obtained his certain information concerning the life of Jesus by a visit to Peter and by questioning the Christians at Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18, ii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14, xi. 23, xv. 1 sqq.). Therefore Strauss is at any rate incorrect when he says in his *Christus des Glaubens*, ed. 1865, p. 193: as if our so thoroughly cooled planet had not once been a glowing mass, and as if we did not know about as much concerning the *time* and the manner of the cooling of the primitive Christian consciousness as of the cooling of the earth.

similar appearances of the time of the Apostles does not exist at all. If an intrinsic relationship had here existed, it would have been impossible for the Apostle Paul to close his list with the fifth or sixth appearance of Jesus. Had a chain of alleged appearances of Jesus been continued indefinitely through the whole of the apostolic age, it might perhaps have been possible to separate the much later manifestations of Jesus from those earlier ones which were brought into immediate connection with his resurrection; but it would have been impossible to limit to merely five or six the earlier appearances which, according to the necessary assumption, would occur at any rate more copiously in the first days and weeks and months. Having made such a sharp and clean division, it is to be taken as proved that there lay between the first five or six appearances and the later often-repeated visions such a great and broad gulf of time, and indeed of character, as rendered it impossible to reckon the latter appearances with the former. At the same time, the factual connection of the resurrection-visions with the later visions is thus destroyed; and doubt is thrown upon even the easily explicable assertion of Paul, that the appearance to him, the sixth and last, was, notwithstanding his admission that it was dissociated from the other like a belated straggler, a member of the series of resurrection-appearances and like them in character and subject.¹ But these later visions—that of Paul included, which the Jewish-Christian Church also refused to recognize—lacked connection with the first appearances of Jesus when restored from death. Sprung from new motives and impulses of a richly inspired young religion, they afford simply no evidence concerning the character and nature of those first appearances,

¹ The fact that most apologists maintain the parity of the appearance to Paul with the appearances to the Apostles, whilst I insist on their imparity, has been employed by Holsten in favour of his view. The contradiction, however, is based simply upon the difference between an apologetic and an historical treatment; and my proposition receives a not to be despised support from the refusal of the Jewish Christians to recognize the equal value of the visions of Paul, including his first vision, and the appearances to the Apostles, 1 Cor. ix. 1 sqq.; 2 Cor. v. 13, &c.

and absolutely fail to offer a suitable testimony and an acceptable hypothesis concerning the origin of the same, concerning their similarity to or parity with the later ones. This observation is remarkably confirmed by a glance at the Acts of the Apostles. In the early period of apostolical activity, despite all the supernatural features and all the glorifications that mark the time, there is nothing at all said of appearances of Jesus, not even on the occasions of the early martyrdoms which might have invited a revival of the vision-standpoint.¹

Leaving the later visions to take care of themselves, we will inquire simply concerning the decisive earlier ones. Visions were seen—so much remains certain according to Paul; but were they self-generated observations, that is, were they produced by the mere reverberation of the physically defunct, spiritually immortal Jesus in the hearts and eyes of the believers? This is at once contradicted by the evidently simple, solemn, almost lifeless, cold, unfamiliar character of the manifestations. Only as the outcome of the strongest, of truly feverish, excitement, as the outcome of the severest conflict of fervid faith and burning love with cold and terrible fate, could such self-generated visions be explained, and indeed they have been so explained. But this is contradicted by all the facts: from beginning to end there are only transient appearances; there is no exchange of words, though we should have expected that in the extreme tension, as in the case of the young man and Apollonius, not only would the eyes be called into play, but the ears would hear

¹ The gift of tongues, though it may go back to A.D. 35, includes no visions, unless the mythical tongues of fire of Acts ii. 3 be insisted upon. The Peter source, which the Acts of the Apostles has incorporated, does not once give visions of Jesus, but at most visions of angels (Acts viii. 26, x. 3, 10 sqq., xii. 7). Even Stephen sees Jesus only in heaven, not upon earth, vii. 55. Particularly striking is it that even the first persecutions (comp. iv. 31, v. 41, xii. 7) produce no Christophany, and that it was reserved to Paul to introduce this (ix. 3, xviii. 9, xxiii. 11); no judicious critic would therefore suppose that the Pauline writer had given to Paul what he had taken from the others, whom he, however, described quite as ideally. This is a serious blow to the vision-hypothesis; an opposition on the part of those authorities in which there might have been expected to be in part reminiscences, and in part strengthened instead of weakened representations.

and love would speak. There are reserve and reticence in the face of the strange phenomenon; there is no trace of a happy, sweet, prolonged repose in the bosom of him who is again endowed with life and love. The agitation that critics have assumed is invisible, or operates very imperfectly; and an appeal to the gulf generally made by death between the living and the departed, would be but the expedient of despair, since it would be full of contradiction.¹

More glaring still becomes the inadequacy of the assumption when we glance at the orderly, regular, and early cessation of the appearances. The exuberance of excitement which generates ocular hallucinations demands a considerable length of time. The ebb does not immediately follow the flood, but is rather brought about by further excesses; one person excites another—Peter the twelve, the twelve the five hundred—and because the mental tension is continued the appearances are repeated, occurring confusedly among the multitude, as every individual repeats what he has seen in his ecstasy, and every one of the twelve and every one of the five hundred demands afresh on his own behoof and in his own mental experience what he has first enjoyed in intercourse with others and has derived from others. Thus the visionary piety of the Montanists, A.D. 120, filled half a century with its multiform follies, notwithstanding all the moderating influences of the Church around. In fact, the advocates of the theory have asserted that there was such an extended duration of the appearances; and Renan has very consistently developed the theory when he speaks, not, it is true, of decades, but of a full year of uninterrupted visions or feverish

¹ The youth who for ten months entreats the dead Apollonius to reveal to him the doctrine of immortality, and who is finally favoured with an appearance, not merely sees him listen to and participate in the conversation of the disciples of wisdom, but also hears him sing with enthusiasm noble rhapsodies of the soul. Philost. 8, 31. Apollonius, contrary to his custom, speaks Latin with Aurelian, because the latter is a Pannonian, Vopis. *Aur.* 24. The above facts, however, favour a spirit-theory, like that of Weisse, in a real or an imaginary sense, rather than the vision-theory. The theory of the merely imaginary appearance (comp. Luke xxiv. 37 sqq.) is refuted by Matt. xiv. 26; Acts xii. 15. *Such an appearance did not produce faith.*

intoxication, which Magdalene, the creator of God, furnished to the world; though he also speaks of an ultimate satiety of citations of the Heavenly One, which had at last become a kind of daily bread and had won contempt.¹ All this is as true with regard to the hypothesis as it is false and frivolous with regard to the apostolic account. There was no host of appearances, no exuberance, no indescribable irregularity, no violent transition. Certainly there were a few repetitions, since Peter, alone and with others, saw the Lord four times, the Apostles saw him thrice, while on the other hand the five hundred saw him but once, and James once. Yet even these repetitions are no confirmation of the theory, but its refutation, because with the repetition of the self-generated vision, the facility, the tendency, the intensity, must grow far beyond the production of a four-fold or a three-fold vision. Still more damaging than the repetition is the end. Not one of the five hundred repeats the ecstasy, and all the cases of ecstasy irrevocably end with the fifth vision. What a contradiction of high-swollen enthusiasm and of sudden ebb even to the point of disappearance! Just when fervid minds are beginning to grow fanatical, the fanaticism absolutely and entirely ceases. It might be possible that a few less ardent natures, though perhaps not Peter, rather James, would quickly recover their mental equilibrium; but in the greater number of the twelve and of the five hundred a movement which had burst the dams would certainly not be stayed in an instant; and yet the narrative says nothing of a third vision to the twelve and nothing of a second to the five hundred.

Finally, the visions not only came to an end, they even made way for a diametrically opposite mental current. There lies

¹ Renan, *Les Apôtres*, 1866, p. 25: les visions (periode de fièvre intense) se multipliaient sans cesse. P. 26: en quelques jours un cycle entier de recits se répandit. P. 34: ces grands rêves melanch. remplissaient les jours et les mois. P. 36: près d'un an s'écoula. Pp. 45, 51: les apparitions devenaient de plus en plus rares. On en parlait beaucoup moins. P. 53: on finit par n'y plus penser beaucoup. Ewald (VI. 3rd ed. pp. 105 sqq.) had already spoken of a slowly diminishing oscillation of the ecstasy through years and decades.

before us the fact that the Apostles passed at once from the visions to the clear recognition of the Messianic dignity, of the heavenly glory of Jesus on the one hand, and to the definite and heroic resolve to bear witness for his cause on the other. For though the Acts of the Apostles might afford ground for dispute as to the date of this recovery of self-possession and clear-mindedness, yet nothing is more certain in and of itself than that the transition to vigorous activity was naturally immediately connected with knowledge of the victory and glorification of Jesus; and even the vision-theory, in order to explain the sudden and early end of the visions, must, judiciously thought out, accommodate itself to the early occurrence of this liberating revulsion. Its supporters may, in fact, think to commend the most intelligible psychological phenomenon by representing the passion of emotion as issuing in and changing to an enthusiasm of will,—a brotherhood of emotion and will which the theory has no need now to prove, since it lies as it were at the foundation of all religious history. But when looked at more closely, how great are the difficulties! The spirits that men call up are not so quickly laid. The impetus of the supposed visions is too strong for it not to be necessary—as, however, was at first assumed—to believe in their intensive tendency to repetition, and in a long series of cases of ecstatic “fusion” (Hüttenbau), with an ultimate lassitude and relaxation, as in other cases of fanatical excitement, e.g. Montanism. The contrary impetus of a changed, intelligent, strongly-willed tendency could come into existence therefore only very gradually, or if quickly only in two cases, namely, either if a stronger counter-excitement suddenly arose, or if the visionary seeing was only a kind of accompaniment to a mental condition which beneath the surface had retained its sobriety.¹ Not one of these suppositions is to the point. The external counter-excitement which would readily restore the dis-

¹ Renan, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 35, 45, cleverly brings about a cessation of the visions by the command of Jesus, given in a vision, to convert the world. New forms of expectation (Spirit, p. 51) and of occupation (gift of tongues, pp. 60 sqq.) operated in the same direction.

turbed equilibrium of the mental powers could only lie either in the tranquillizing influence of a more temperate party, which existed later in Jewish Christianity as opposed to Paul and in the Church as opposed to Montanism, but which did not at this time exist; or in the active opposition of Judaism, which cannot be demonstrated at this early date, and which at any rate would, as in the cases of other persecuted religious parties, have produced only a combination of martyrs and visions.¹ And the inner counter-excitement, the counter-working of the luminous elements of the spirit of day-life against the night-life, cannot possibly have operated so powerfully and so efficaciously, even though we recall everything—the character of the school of Jesus, Peter's accuracy and delicacy of perception, and the strength of will of the well-known pair of brothers. In that giving play to the ecstatic impulse, which the theory attributes to every individual disciple, particularly to Peter, and beyond the individuals to the common mind and common life of the community, the very centre of calm, clear self-possession was affected, dislodged, driven towards the periphery; whilst the dark element of the life of the soul, with its elementary vigour that could not be at once again exhausted and controlled, was called to the sovereignty of the mind. If, therefore, there was actually an early, an immediate transition from the visions to a calm self-possession and to a self-possessed energy, then the visions did not proceed from self-generated visionary over-excitement and fanatical agitation among the multitude.

All these considerations compel us to admit that the theory which has recently become the favourite one is only an hypothesis which, while it explains something, leaves the main fact unexplained, and indeed subordinates what is historically attested

¹ On the moderating influence of the church at Jerusalem upon Paul, see *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 137 sq. The hostilities in Acts iv. v. are much too insignificant, and are not the consequences of visionary disturbances, but rather of the *already commenced* preaching of the Messiah. The martyrdom of Stephen falls according to the common opinion a few years, according to my calculation at any rate a year, after the death of Jesus.

to weak and untenable views. But if the attempt to retain the traditional history of the resurrection miscarries, as well as the undertaking to construct a natural explanation of what occurred by the help of the Pauline visions, then nothing remains but to admit that the mythical character of the detailed narratives, and the obscure brevity of what is credible in the history, do not enable us to arrive at a certain and incontestable result concerning the mysterious events that closed the life of Jesus, weighty as they are in themselves and influential as they have been in the history of the world. For history, which reckons only with concrete numbers and with sequences of tangible, recognized causes and effects, there exists as factual and unquestionable simply the belief of the Apostles that Jesus rose again, with the immense result of that belief, the Christianizing of mankind. This was the position taken up by Hegel, and afterwards by Baur; and it is to their modest, sober, common-sense position that we must return from the vaunted explanatory suppositions.¹ Whoever goes beyond that position, and in defence of his theories adopts the opinion that it is merely necessary to correct the reports by supposing the occurrence of either many, perhaps unnumbered, visions, or of only one, the special vision seen by Peter, thus in the former case establishing the outburst and continuance of the visions, or in the latter case supplying an explanation of the speedy transition to ordinary conditions, the

¹ Hegel, *Rel. Phil.* II. p. 250: the resurrection belongs essentially to faith. After his resurrection Christ appeared only to his own friends; this is not external history for unbelief, but this appearance is only for faith. Similarly, Baur, *First Three Centuries*, Eng. trans. I. p. 42. Also Biedermann, *Zeitstimmen*, I. p. 360. Similarly, Baur on Paul, see the chapter on Paul's conversion in *Paul*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 61 sqq. His explanation was often censured, comp. Landerer, *Worte der Erinnerung*, 1861, pp. 70 sqq. Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 398 (Baur avoids the burning question); whilst Holsten found himself "provoked" and stimulated to his "Christ-vision of Paul" (*Einkl.* p. 3), by Baur's incidental designation of the resurrection as a miracle (*First Three Centuries*, *l.c.*). Comp. Gebhardt, p. 2. The conservative tendency quoted Baur's words with satisfaction, Steinm. p. 24. Schaff, *Person Jesu Chr.* 1871, pp. 159, 228. Here, indeed, reference is made to a still older expression of Baur's (*Bengel's Archiv.* II. p. 715): historical truth of the resurrection of Jesus.

preponderance of sober action—whoever does this, does it at his own pleasure and his own risk.

Christian faith can, however, go a step further; not because it is able, by prejudice or conviction, to make the uncertain certain, but because its yearning to rise from the world to God, from the natural to the supernatural, impels it to overstep the boundaries of material perception and the natural order of the world to which science and history are bound. It oversteps these boundaries, not merely in the certain assurance that Jesus, however he left the earth, took his course to the higher world of God and of spirits in order to bless the future, and, by his work embodied in the Church, to conform the present life to the future; but also in the conviction that it was he and no other who, as dead yet risen again, as celestially glorified even if not risen, vouchsafed visions to his disciples, revealed himself to his community. In making this assumption, faith is not only beyond the reach of refutation, since science is compelled to leave the mystery of the final events of Jesus's career unsolved without weakening the foundations of faith by a single comment; but it completes and illumines what to science remained an obscure point and a vexatious limitation of its knowledge. And faith is able to complete it in such a way that the justifiable claims of thought in the province of faith and in the human conception of the nature of Jesus are not crushed in the mysteries of his life-history.

It was not merely the uncertainty of the accounts that compelled science to come to a halt in this obscure province; for, pushing its way from the impure to the pure, it took up its position at the primitive natural account by Paul, and earnestly sought from that a solution of the difficulty. But as the natural solution which its principle led it to seek was not arrived at, science came to a standstill and, with or without reservation, renounced any further attempt. Faith, to which the province of facts, of history, extends and deepens from the visible to the

invisible, begins to build at the point where science left off. If the visions are not something humanly generated or self-generated, if they are not blossom and fruit of an illusion-producing over-excitement, if they are not something strange and mysterious, if they are directly accompanied by astonishingly clear perceptions and resolves, then there still remains one originating source, hitherto unmentioned, namely, God and the glorified Christ. Spinoza incidentally expresses this opinion; and those recent critics who are as little satisfied with the mythical as with the visionary, have reverted to this assumption of a higher power, of a divine impulsion, or of a continued interposition of the glorified person of Jesus.¹ The glorified Christ has been decisively mentioned by Weisse, and after him by Seydel; and Fichte has spoken still better of a spiritual influence of Jesus, who continued to live on in a higher form of existence, an influence which, according to the law of the eccentric projection of overpowering soul-impressions, embodied itself in ocular visions.² Unless we arbitrarily introduce into the reports a fresh element, the production of the appearances is to be ascribed, not to God, but to him whose presence was observed. Again, unless,

¹ Thus Weizs. p. 573. Holtzmann, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 532. Also Ewald, Schenkel, and A. Schweizer speak of a glorified Christ. In the spirit of Schleiermacher (and with echoes of Lessing) A. Schweizer, in a sermon on the Sunday after Easter, 1871, upon "War and Peace in the Light of the Gospel," says: "We have celebrated this fact because we ourselves experience the royal rule of Christ over us. But the first disciples, lacking this testimony, had their shattered faith restored by the revelation to them, in an extraordinary manner, of their Master glorified out of death. Yet everything proceeds in accordance with the original universal law, according to which God brings about whatever happens, even that which is possible only in rare circumstances, nay, even that which, like the centre of a circle, can occur but *once*." What Schweizer correctly designates as unique, Krauss, p. 223, Krüger-Velthusen, *L.J.* 1872, p. 264, incorrectly conceive only as an intensive form of Matt. xviii. 20; accordingly these appearances should still continue. On the whole, the premisses fail, in the opinion of many, to give tenability to the conservative view. Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 181; Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 397; Spinoza, see above, p. 332, n 3.

² Weisse, II. pp. 426, 432 sqq., expresses himself in favour of the real presence of the person of the departed Saviour. Subjectively human addition he finds, not so much in the seeing as in the hearing, the disciples having clothed their intuitions with uttered words, II. p. 422. This is again an unhappy division of the objective and the subjective. Like Weisse, also Seydel, in *Schenkel's Zeitschr.* 1870, p. 191.

contrary to all facts and all ideas upon the subject, we fall back upon corporeal appearances of spirits, such as in a truly popular way Celsus speaks of and Weisse favours, a sharp division must be made between objective influence and subjectively visionary figures.¹ If it be objected that the difficulties of the vision-theory are thus in a weakened form renewed, that the subjective self-engendering of the vision would only somewhat differently introduce all that excitement and tendency to repetition which the vision-theory asserts but which the facts exclude, that nothing but the most delicate susceptibility of the disciples, in other words, the recognition of the exclusive action of Jesus, whether corporeal or incorporeal, in the vision would explain the speedy cessation of the vision-seeing, the rapid transition to sober thinking: it can be replied, that if the power that produces the vision comes, as according to our view it does, entirely from without, and the subjective seeing is merely the reflex-form of what is objective, the immediate cessation of the seeing and of the will to see, as soon as the operating power ceases to operate, becomes perfectly intelligible. For the rest, this question, at least the question whether Jesus directly or only indirectly supplied the form of the vision, is of a subordinate character; and even the corporeal appearance may be granted to those who are afraid of losing everything unless they have this plastic representation for their thought and their faith.

It is to be expected that this exposition of faith on behalf of faith will displease many, both on the right and the left; that the displeased will appeal to Lessing; that with Strauss they will ridicule this second edition of Weisse's spectre, or will find a merely imaginary transient apparition a more plausible explanation of the Christian belief.² Let those who ridicule, present us

¹ Origen, *Con. Cels.* 7, 35. Above, p. 332, n. 1. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 296, gives an explanation very similar to the above.

² Origen, *Con. Cels. l.c.*, rejects the opinion of a πνεῦμα. Lessing, *Duplik*, in *Werke*, IX. p. 108: when will men leave off hanging eternity upon a spider's web? Strauss indulges in ridicule in his work, *Die Halben und die Ganzen*, p. 62 (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1877, V. p. 188). Also Hase, p. 274, and others have pro-

with a better explanation. If it be asked : Was it possible ? was it necessary ?—the answer is : Both. The question of the influence of the beings of the other world upon those of this, is an open one. According to Lessing and Kant, all stories of returned spirits throughout the long history of mankind fall to the ground as superstition ; yet, despite those who smile, the possibility of the exercise of an influence by such spirits still remains according to the admission of these thinkers, and with this Weisse should have been content without fanciful additions.¹ The human mind has an impression that there exists a bond of which the faculty of perception and the understanding cannot obtain a clear representation. But to have brought to light and unveiled what otherwise exists in the human mind only as an obscure sentiment, a confused idea, a mere impression of the immediate consciousness, was the prerogative, the human prerogative, of Jesus, inasmuch as he revealed himself to his followers in an incontestable manner. His prerogative was based upon the pre-eminence of his spirit-nature and upon the strength of his power of will, upon his yearning love for his followers and for his great cause, and upon the susceptibility of his disciples. But was it necessary ? Had he, in reality, not yet finished his work ? Yes, his work was finished, and yet not finished. He had nothing to add, nothing to complete, nothing to improve ; therefore he only showed himself, showed that he lived, and disappeared again without giving any fresh teaching, any addition to his teaching or to his commissions. But the facts of the Jewish consciousness, and even what we know of the circumstances of the Apostles after the death of Jesus, make it more than probable that this finished work, which was to affect the history of the world,

nounced against Weisse. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* I. p. 296, rightly deprecates the charge. Against the imaginary apparition, above, p. 355, n. 1.

¹ Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, *Werke*, 1841 (Götschen), VII. p. 64. Kant's *Kleine Schriften*, II. pp. 420 sqq. Quoted in Weisse, II. pp. 434 sq. Weisse's fantastic addition consists partly in a spirit-appearance instead of a spirit-revelation, partly in the belief in a magnetic miraculous gift of Jesus to act magically upon susceptible persons even after his death (p. 438).

would have been ruined by the disastrous death of the Messiah. The Jews, from the contemporaries of Paul the Apostle down to Trypho, Justin Martyr's antagonist, rebelled with contemptuous indignation against the Christ on the cross, who, according to the letter of the Law, was *cursed by God himself*, religiously annihilated; and our optimistic calculation concerning the indestructibility of the belief of the eye-witnesses has led us to the conclusion that the love and reverence which survived the cross and the grave, nevertheless in reality had not strength enough in sober earnestness, or even in genuinely Oriental feverish visions, to convince the disciples and others that Jesus lived a Messiah in the bosom of God, until this fact had, from without, essentially from without, been again made clear within.¹ Thus all evidences go to prove that the belief in the Messiah would have died out without the living Jesus; and by the return of the Apostles to the synagogue, to Judaism, the gold of the words of Jesus would have been buried in the dust of oblivion. The greatest of men would have passed away and left no trace; for a time Galilee would have preserved some truth and fiction about him; but his cause would have begotten no religious exaltation and no Paul. Or can we believe that Paul and another, by collecting and saving a few fortunately preserved sayings, could afterwards restore the Christian religion?

We find ourselves in the midst of impossibilities when we make the ordained of God so end, or when we so leave the matter to the chance-play of visions, that he is awaked from the dead for the dead. The evidence that Jesus was alive, the telegram from heaven, was necessary after an earthly downfall which was unexampled, and which in the childhood of the human race would be convincing; the evidence that he was alive was therefore given by his own impulsion and by the will of God.² The

¹ On the cross and Judaism, see 1 Cor. i. 23. Justin, Trypho, see above, p. 142.

² Origen's objection to Celsus's apparition (*φάσμα*), 7, 35, does not exactly apply. He asks, how could a spirit afterwards effect such great things, convert men and defeat demons? He does not once consider whether such an appearance could produce strong and active faith.

Christianity of to-day owes to this evidence, first its Lord, and next its own existence:¹ the latter, because it rejoices in *him*, and because it sees its *own* future. What ran through mankind as a contradicted sign, the presentiment of its future, has become a bright light and a clear truth through Him alone, spiritually through his word and visibly through his act. "Children of God!" he cried boldly and loudly; he has dissipated the anxious dread of the title that was without right and without office, by showing the firm ground of a heavenly future of the children of God, the common home, and his own rights. Thus, though much has fallen away, the secure faith-fortress of the resurrection of Jesus remains; and though many would with Spinoza refuse to accommodate their view of the universe to this event, it is enough that others do not find their view of the universe contradicted.² If here the calm tone of history makes the heart throb more warmly, the long and circuitous route is justified by the attainment of the wished-for end.

C.—THE ASCENSION.

Regarded simply, without any further pretensions, as the expression of a conviction of Jesus's entrance into a higher world, the assertion of the ascension of Jesus is not in a strict sense demonstrable, but is an article of belief which naturally follows from a higher conception of the destiny of man, of the claims of Jesus in particular and of the mysterious facts of his life's close, those indications of a new and higher life of the soul of Jesus; it follows, indeed, from all the facts of his career.³

¹ More in detail, *Gesch Chr.* pp. 210 sqq., where other views are also noticed. Comp. Güder, pp. 45, 49. Gebh. pp. 77 sqq. Pressensé, p. 667. Steinm. pp. 40 sqq., 157.

² Spinoza on the raising of Lazarus, in Bayle, *Diction.* IV. p. 1098: il aurait brisé en pièces tout son système; il aurait embrassé sans répugnance la foi ordinaire des Chrétiens. Similar admissions in *Zeits.* 1861, p. 349, in Güder, pp. 3, 5.

³ Thus Neander, p. 596. On the ascension compare, besides the sources mentioned in connection with the resurrection and in Hase, p. 282, Griesbach, *Sylloge* (1812)

This reception into heaven, which, according to the Old Testament mode of thought, involved the sitting on the throne and at the right hand of God, is, when thus stated generally and without materialistic colouring, the unanimous assertion of the New Testament, from Paul to the Revelation, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John, though indignantly denied by the Jews.¹ It must, however, here be admitted that antiquity believed in it in a way and from motives different from those of modern times. Ascension into heaven—heaven being conceived as a distinct world above the earth and as the seat of God and of all perfection—was regarded as a great privilege that distinguished a man above the majority of mankind, imparting an exceptional equality with a few specially favoured ones, such as Moses, Enoch, Elijah, and possibly Ezra. In the belief of antiquity, this exalted Jesus above all, enabling him, as the Messiah, as the representative or throne-companion of God, to dwell in heaven, where it was necessary for him to be, because without this entrance into the high abode of God he would lack the chief mark of Messiahship.² Modern piety can dispense with these Jewish-Christian views, since it has lost the material idea of the Messiah as well as the conception of a seat of God and his Messiah, and has found instead a belief in an infinite

in *Opusc. Ac. ed. Gabler, 1825, II. pp. 471 sqq.* Ammon, *Ascensus J. Chr. in cælum hist. bibl., Opusc. Nov. p. 43.* G. Kinkel's historical critical inquiry concerning Christ's ascension, in *Stud. und Krit.*, 1841. Greve, *Die Himmelfahrt uns. Herrn. J.C. 1868.* Hengstenberg, *Ev. K.-Z.* 1868, Nos. 67 sqq.

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rom. viii. 34, x. 6; Rev. iii. 21, vii. 17 (xi. 12), xii. 5, xxii. 3; Heb. i. 3, 13, iv. 14, vi. 20, viii. 1, ix. 11, x. 12, xii. 2; John iii. 13, 31, vi. 62, xx. 17. Elsewhere in N.T., besides Acts i. 11, ii. 33, iii. 21, vii. 56 sq., see also Eph. i. 20, ii. 6, iv. 8—10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Peter iii. 22. *Barn.* 15. Usual expression, ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι; sursum tolli, Acts i. 2, 11, 22; Mark xvi. 19; 1 Tim. iii. 16; and ἀνάληψις, Luke ix. 51. Ἀναβὰς, John. iii. 13, &c., and Eph. iv. 10; πορευθεῖς, 1 Peter iii. 22, comp. Acts i. 11. Exaltation (Acts ii. 33) to the right hand, Rom. viii. 34; Acts vii. 56 (comp. ii. 33); Mark xvi. 19; Heb. i. 3. Throne by the side of God, Rev. iii. 21, &c. The Old Test. basis, Ps. cx. 1; comp. only 1 Cor. xv. 23 sqq. Denial by the Jews, Oehler, *Messias*, p. 437.

² Above, IV. p. 288. The teaching of the Church protested, however, against the local conception. Aeg. Hunnius, in Steinm. p. 229. Spiritualizing in Schleierm. *Dogm.* II. p. 85; *L.J.* p. 502: confusion of material history and spiritual conception.

universe of God and in a more exalted future existence of man in higher than earthly worlds. This future which modern piety claims for the race as a whole, it necessarily claims with a stronger conviction on behalf of Him who, living and dying in God, brought into operation the great faith of the children of God: only it cannot venture, if it would avoid idle dreams, to describe in detail Jesus's position of authority and service in a domain which no eye has seen, which God has reserved to Himself, which even Jesus, with a humble and chaste reticence, never described.¹

The question assumes a different shape when, instead of a general belief in the exaltation of Jesus, the subject under consideration is the detailed and more or less materialistic description by which the Gospels, yielding to a natural longing and to Jewish-Christian curiosity, have attempted to unveil and to give tangibility to an obscure fact. We have already in reality pronounced a verdict upon this attempt: the materialistically depicted ascension is only the closing point of the appearances of the risen Jesus, the places and times of whose appearance and the conversations of whom have already been questioned, and whose corporeity in particular has been rejected on the most certain evidence, from the bodily resurrection down to the bodily ascension. But because of the special importance which the visible ascension has assumed in the Gospels and in the tradition of the Church, a more minute investigation of this last occurrence has been postponed until now. The interest which one takes in this must be a double one, dependent in part upon the confirmation of the historical character of these proceedings, in part upon the observation of the process of formation of the close of the Christ myths.

Paul and all the Gospels have spoken of a last meeting of Jesus with the twelve, Luke indeed twice, in the first and in the second parts of his primitive Christianity, in the Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles. Since the last meeting in the fourth

¹ Comp. Matt. xx. 23, xxiv. 36.

Gospel is introduced merely for the purpose of converting Thomas, Jesus's farewell of his followers is here to be looked for in the last appearance but one. That the Apostle Paul describes this last meeting with only a word, speaking merely of a vision and saying nothing of a conversation or of an ascension to heaven—which ascension, taking place invisibly, both for him and for John really preceded the appearances of Jesus to the disciples—is here to be premised, as well as the great disagreement among the Gospels as to place and time and details of this last manifestation, Luke not being able to maintain consistency with himself in his first and second parts. It only remains, therefore, to examine the last revelations which he is said to have given, and the mode of his separation from his disciples.

The last Galilean revelation of Jesus in Matthew—in truth the only one in Matthew—consists of three parts: an announcement of his investment with full power in heaven and upon earth; a commission to preach to all nations, who are to be made disciples by baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and by obedience to the genuinely Jewish-Christian precepts of Jesus, which are emphasized in a way characteristic of Matthew; and finally a promise that he will be with the Apostles all the days until the end of terrestrial time.² Each of these has its own individual value, particularly the statement about the victorious Messiahship of Jesus; and further, one supports another; for from Jesus's unlimited authority follows his right to the nations of the earth, as does also the certain hope of the disciples that they will have one in heaven to help them, one whose help is rendered necessary by their being alone upon earth and by their gigantic work among the nations of the earth. These utterances, which at first, notwithstanding their solemnity, do not impress one as specially characteristic and are not humanly cordial, appear to gain a firmer basis by the institution of baptism, which the Apostles and Paul

¹ In fact it stands here, John xx. 21—23.

² Matt. xxviii. 16 sqq.; comp. Haggai i. 13, ii. 5; Dan. xii. 13.

afterwards practised, but which is not mentioned anywhere in the earlier Gospels except here in Matthew and then in Mark.¹ But there is nothing in the way of the assumption that this passage about baptism—if Jesus ever uttered it—became, like other utterances, a wandering passage, and that it was left to Gospel tradition to give it a fixed place at the most decisive point, at the last farewell of Jesus and in connection with the mission to the nations. A closer examination might even appear to show that baptism was first suggested and practised by the Apostles at the time of their earliest organization of the Church, and that, as a practice of the disciples acting in the spirit of the Master, it was afterwards placed in the mouth of the departing Jesus, in a passage the literal historical character of which is entirely overthrown by a series of incidental statements by the Apostle Paul.² Yet it is this very Apostle who, by his estimate

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16 (where the passage belongs to the original part of the Gospel). On the other hand, John iii. 5, 22, iv. 1 sq. In the apostolic time, Acts ii. 38, &c.; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. i. 13 sqq., vi. 11, xii. 13; Rom. vi. 3; Col. ii. 12. Heer (in the *Kirchenfreund*) was led by a former suggestion of my own to seek a guarantee of the resurrection in the fact of the institution of baptism. Also Gess, p. 204.

² There is much that appears to be opposed to the institution of baptism by Jesus: his reference to baptism as a past practice of the Baptist's, Matt. xxi. 25, comp. xi. 11; and the fresh application of the idea, Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 38; Acts i. 5, xi. 16; as well as the institution of the Lord's Supper at the close of his ministry (comp. above, III. pp. 342 sq., II. p. 376). Further, the absence of the institution of baptism from Luke, notwithstanding a relationship in other respects with the previous Gospels, xxiv. 47; and the prospect of a spiritual baptism *instead of* the Johannine water baptism, Acts i. 5, xi. 16; which latter is, however, renewed, ii. 38 (but comp. xviii. 25), without previous notice. Further, the definite assertion of Paul that Jesus sent *him not* to baptize but to preach, 1 Cor. i. 17, comp. ix. 14. Finally, the remarkable combinations of baptism with the death of Jesus and with the coming of the Spirit, both by Paul, Rom. vi. 3, Col. ii. 12, comp. Gal. iii. 27, &c. (Spirit), and in John iii. 5, xix. 34, 1 John v. 6; in John iv. 2, also in such a way that with the non-baptizing by Jesus, the baptizing by the Apostles merely is in a remarkable manner admitted. The placing of baptism and the Lord's Supper side by side, 1 Cor. x. 1 sqq., xii. 13, to which I myself, in *Gesch. Chr.* p. 24, mainly appealed, might appear to many to be no proof of the institution of baptism by Jesus, but of the importance and force of the apostolic baptism. We must not, however, overlook (1) the Pauline emphasis upon the historicity of the parallel Lord's Supper; (2) the impossibility of the introduction of so great a novelty by the Apostles, which novelty in the first years would be altogether forbidden by piety towards Jesus and by fear of the Jews; hence the attempt to ascribe the institution of baptism to the creative

of baptism and by his giving to it the same rank as to the other sign, the Lord's Supper, has made the institution of baptism by Jesus very plausible. On this as well as on other accounts, we have already endeavoured to fix this institution in the days of Jesus's farewell before his death.

This transformation of the matter and its place can be the more readily admitted because the greatest doubt exists as to the authenticity of the whole of the last utterance about baptism, and that without taking account of Paul's absolute silence as to any sayings by the risen Jesus.¹ The investment of Jesus with all power and authority looks rather Jewish and Daniel-like, whilst Jesus has spoken with immediate truth only of a giving over of minds to his conception of the world.² Further, the baptismal formula—for the beginning is here made into such—this baptismal formula in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Spirit, that is, according to the ideas of the later Church, in the three sanctifying forces of Christianity, is in absolute contradiction to the simplicity of the rite of baptism in the apostolic time, when converts were baptized

process of construction resulting from the visions (Weisse, II. p. 423) has miscarried ; (3) Jesus's defence of the divine origin of John's baptism, in his very last days at Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 25. On these grounds, the institution of baptism has been (by way of conjecture) placed at the time of the historical farewell, see above, V. p. 333. The Fragmentist (pp. 74—83), in view of Jesus's abstinence from ceremonial and of the Trinitarian formula in Matthew, questioned the institution of baptism by Jesus ; it has not been questioned by Schleierm., pp. 363 sqq., and Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 644, but it has been questioned by Weiss, I. pp. 406 sqq., II. p. 423 ; comp. also Witten, *Idee des Menschen*, p. 175. Whilst Lücke, *Komm. Joh.* p. 559, in a very untenable manner (definite belief in Jesus the Christ seldom showed itself during the lifetime of Jesus, comp. Lange, II. p. 515) explained the passing out of notice of baptism, which, however, is so distinctly assumed in John, Neander, p. 156, and Ewald, V. pp. 344 sq., thought that Jesus at first only permitted his disciples to practise the Johannine usage ; Lange, again, II. p. 515, and Weizs., p. 333, also Hase, p. 130, thought that after the ban upon Israel by the violence done to the Baptist (Lange), or better (Weizs.) after the collision between the Johannine baptism and the hierarchy, Jesus renounced baptism for a time. The institution at the close is distinctly held by Neander, Gess, and Steinmeyer.

¹ Even Bleek, II. p. 507, takes it to be not literally exact, but only a summary.

² Matt. xi. 27 (see above, IV. p. 59), comp. Dan. ii. 38, vii. 14, 25 sqq. Weifenbach, p. 75, comp. p. 36, retaining the passage, identifies the meaning with Matt. xi.

merely in the name of Jesus. It contradicts also the directly subsequent mention, not of the gifts of grace, but of the obligation imposed upon the baptized, which could simply be the following of Jesus—not of God or the Spirit—and is expressly made to refer only to Jesus and his commands. Once more, least of all does this formula harmonize with the modesty of Jesus, who did not regard himself as God, or as the just medium between God and the Spirit, but merely as a serviceable instrument of both, a view with which this formula, with its equalizations, is inconsistent, even if it is only an excrescence of the later doctrine of the Trinity and not that doctrine itself.¹ Finally, the commission to baptize all nations certainly did not proceed from the lips of Jesus, for the apostolic period shows nothing more certainly than that the Apostles knew nothing of such a commission, that, on the contrary, they made use of the narrow formula represented by the Gospels themselves, a sending to the people, a mission to the Jews!² The surmise is readily suggested that none of this description of the farewell address belongs to the original Matthew.³ This description possesses

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19, *εἰς τ. ὄνομα*=leshem (as Samar., *Avod. Sar.* f. 27, 1, in Schöttgen, p. 239, circumcized leshem har Gerissin, and the Jews presented the Passover lamb to the priests leshem pesach, Lightfoot, p. 377), that is, with a reference to the person and authority, but not simply autoritate (beshem), as Schöttgen thinks. Comp. commentators. The continual insistence upon the following of Christ (Matt. xvi. 24), the name of Christian (Acts xi. 26), even the baptismal instruction required by Matt. (xxviii. 20), point to the high degree of authenticity in the simple formula. The amplified formula introduced the energy of divine grace, Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 4 sqq., 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 3. The simple formula, 1 Cor. i. 13, vi. 11; Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3; Acts ii. 38, viii. 16. The Fragmentist (see above) declared himself against the Matthew-formula, as did also Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 643 (ritual), and De Wette; on the other hand, the weak defence of Krabbe, p. 530, Bleek, II. p. 507, and Meyer, pp. 569 sq. Gess, p. 203, draws a very serious conclusion from the three Persons and Godheads. Comp. Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 58 note, and p. 60. But what the last asserts in the text, he has retracted in note 3 (well-grounded doubt).

² Acts x. 42; Gal. ii. 1 sqq. Gess, p. 205, gets out of the difficulty (after Neander, p. 594) by supposing that the Apostle did not shrink from the actual mission to the heathen, but only from the freedom of the heathen from the Law. Is that true as to Paul and the Acts of the Apostles?

³ Thus Teller, in *Excurs. II.* on Burnet. *lib. d. fid. et offic. Chr.* p. 262; on the contrary, not only Beckhaus on the genuineness of the so-called baptismal formula, 1794, but also De Wette and Strauss. Recently Strauss (*New Life*, Eng. trans. II.

early attestation, by Justin in the middle of the second century, and in the Clementines; it may, notwithstanding, have been the work of the editor, who was passionately desirous of exhibiting a sympathy of Jesus with the heathen, and overlooked the express point of view of the Evangelist, that the Jews, according to Jesus's own presentiment, were to be converted after Jesus's death. The baptismal formula itself is probably still later, originating in the first half of the second century.¹ It is no longer possible to discover with certainty how the Gospel originally read. But it is probable that the Apostles were designated to a general mission or to a mission to the people, even though the words concerning the investment of Jesus with all power stood close by; the baptismal formula, however, would exhibit the natural simplicity of the apostolic time, and would, as it appears from Paul and Luke, place the Apostles under no immediate obligation to administer baptism.² But even this presumable more correct farewell was not the farewell of Jesus, who is the less likely to have uttered a formal farewell since in each Gospel he is made to do it differently. This passage is only a later recapitulation of what Jesus had earlier commanded and the apostolic age had practised in the spirit of Jesus's commands.

The farewells in the other Gospels can be more quickly dismissed, since Matthew, the most impressive reporter, has not

p. 424, against 4th ed. II. p. 643) ascribes the passage to the latest editing, and Hilgenfeld has changed his position from his *Evangelien*, 1854, p. 109, where he questioned only *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, to his essay of 1865, p. 60, where he would cut out still more, and to that of 1868, p. 74, where he hands over xxviii. 16—20 to the editor, that is to the Gentile-favouring Evangelist. It is easy to see that this Trinity is quite foreign not only to the Gospel (x. 20, xii. 28, 31, xxii. 43), but in reality also to the Christology of the editor.

¹ Justin, *Ap.* 1, 61. Clem. *Hom.* 9, 23; 11, 26; 13, 21; 17, 7 sq. Irenæus, 3, 17, 1. The *παρεδόθη* already in *Hermæ Pastor*, *Sim.* 5, 6, and *Πιστ. σοφ.* in Anger, *Synopse*, pp. 261 sq. Conversion of the Jews, Matt. xxiii. 39. We can infer the very late date of the baptismal formula from the age of the Acts of the Apostles.

² 1 Cor. i. 14—17; Acts x. 48; Luke xxiv. 47. The words of Paul can be explained also from the standpoint of the primary apostolic vocation, 1 Cor. i. 23, xii. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 2; Rom. i. 16. The conquest of the world not excluded, see above, V. p. 266.

been able to keep his ground. Luke narrates three last communications of Jesus, which have points of contact with the farewell in Matthew without being identical with it: namely, instruction as to the way to glory through the cross; a commission to preach repentance and conversion in Jerusalem, and then among all nations; and finally, a promise that the disciples should speedily be endued with power from on high for their missionary vocation.¹ These statements, with the exception of the plain, primitive-evangelical command to preach repentance and conversion—in which the baptism of the Apostles is as yet entirely lacking—awake on the whole but little confidence.² These posthumous teachings are merely the repetition of the Emmaus conversation and somewhat unnecessary alleviations of the intellectual labour of the Apostles. This preaching first at Jerusalem and then among all nations is a compromise between tradition and Paulinism, and is at all points contradicted by the source of the Acts of the Apostles with its “preaching for the people.” Finally, this promise of the Spirit, elsewhere narrated in more genuine words, is only an artificial bridge from Easter to Pentecost.³ Again, we do not yet know whether we ought to follow the author in the last chapter of his Gospel rather than in the first of his Acts of the Apostles. In the latter he gives a very different narrative, and transfers the day of departure from the first day of the

¹ Luke xxiv. 44—49.

² Strauss, 4th ed. II., finds no essential difference between Luke and Matt. On the other hand, Volkmar, p. 624, comp. p. 619, thinks that for the Pauline writer, as for Paul, the love-feast remained the highest sacrament, the one specially derived from Jesus, whilst the Jewish-Christian church sought in baptism a substitute for circumcision. Hence Luke has thrust baptism upon the Apostles, Acts ii. 38. It is certainly amusing to find that the primitive Pauline Mark (Volkmar, p. 619) ascribes the institution of baptism to Jesus, it is true without (see below, p. 356, n. 1) its being necessary to salvation! But this is word-play which contradicts itself. Without resorting to shifts and expedients, we can only say that in his sources Luke did not find the institution of baptism immediately ascribed to Jesus, or he would not have passed it over.

³ Matt. x. 19; Luke xii. 11, xxi. 14 sq.; Mark xiii. 11. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 647, quite incorrectly says that Matt. gives the earliest, Luke the latest, outpouring of the Spirit.

V resurrection to the fortieth, from a Sunday to a Thursday, mainly in order to get near to Pentecost, the fiftieth day.¹ It is true that the Acts of the Apostles consistently follows the last point of the farewell in the Gospel, the promise of the Spirit. The misunderstanding—invisible in the Gospel—of the disciples, who make the promise to mean a near second advent and the Jewish dream of royalty, gives a welcome occasion to a new and important explanation by Jesus, which is in reality only the introductory programme of the author. The dream of a political Messiah is rejected, the return of Jesus projected into an indefinite future, the spiritual vocation of the disciples pointed out, and the sphere of labour defined by the mouth of the Master—Jerusalem, all Judæa and Samaria, and then the ends of the earth. The disagreement with all the other sources, the mechanical form of the commission, the formula by which Jews and heathens were put upon an equality,—these things determine the non-historical character of the report.²

There remain John and the closing paragraphs in Mark. John places the commission and the promise on the day of resurrection, as Luke's Gospel does; only the Sunday of the Apostles is followed by a Sunday for Thomas, and the promise of the Spirit is very significantly transformed into a gift of the Spirit, so that even Pentecost disappears, because Easter is everything and

¹ Strauss has correctly explained the astonishing alterations of Luke in Acts i. from the growth of new sources. The fortieth day is, according to the ecclesiastical calculation of festivals, a Thursday, whereby the self-contradiction of Luke becomes very plain, but a disagreement with the proper Synoptical tradition does not positively exist, inasmuch as that tradition fixes the meeting again of Jesus with the Apostles first on the third day after the resurrection. On the ground of this calculation the fortieth day would also be a Sunday.

² It is one and the same author who in ch. i. gives the programme, and in the rest of the book shows how that programme was carried out. I would incidentally mention that the exegetists and critics of the Acts of the Apostles have not yet (down to Overbeck) come upon the trace of the division of the book. The turning-point is generally looked for at xiii. 1. Lekebusch was nearer the truth when he surmised it to be in the Stephen-narrative. But the turning-point stands marked as clearly as daylight in ix. 31, and "Petrus et Paulus" is very finely introduced in both series.

includes it.¹ After Jesus has shown his wounds, he says solemnly: "Peace be unto you! As the Father has sent me, so send I you." Then he breathes upon them: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit!" and he thereby invests them with power to forgive and to retain sins. We here plainly detect a further development out of Luke in the gift of the Spirit and in the right to forgive, the announcement of which latter is moreover made in a formula arbitrarily reconstructed from the old sources.² In this the author's dogmatic plays a rôle. The Logos is continued in the Apostles; the duality of Father and Son is enlarged into the trinity of Father, Son, and believers; their bond is the Holy Spirit passing from the Father to the Son, from the Son, at the moment of his withdrawal, to the Apostles. The form of the transference is that of the breath, because that, although material even to its impact, belonged to the primary meaning of the Greek word *πνεῦμα*, and in a certain degree also to the predictions of the Nicodemus discourse, nay to the Old Testament history of the creation, which was completed by the Son of God.³ The close of Mark, as far as it can be regarded as genuine, forms a connecting link between Matthew and Luke on the one side and John on the other. Like Matthew and Luke, it gives the commission to preach to all the world, and like Matthew it adds baptism; and it prepares for John, but in a different way to Luke, by placing the gift of the Spirit in prospect. It is characteristic of the manner of Mark that baptism is connected with

¹ John xx. 21—23. Incorrect exposition by Strauss, 4th ed. II. pp. 647 sqq., that Luke represents the extreme development in the question of the Spirit. Harmonizing of Luke and John, *e.g.* Lücke, double outpouring; Tholuck, announcement (*λάβετε* equals *λήψετε*) and fulfilment, &c. In Strauss, *l.c.* pp. 645 sqq.

² The formula in John xx. 23 evidently presupposes the old Synoptic Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18, and is a modification of these, not without misunderstanding. See above, IV. pp. 265, 340. The distinction between remissible and unremissible sins (mortal sins) in the sense of the second century, is here (against Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 429) not thought of.

³ John iii. 8; Acts ii. 2; and especially Gen. ii. 7: *ἐνεφύσησεν*, &c. Thus the Jesus-Logos became the creative transmitter of the divine principle, of the heavenly man, to the earthly man. This parallel is so striking that we must renounce any other, such as 1 Kings xix. 12 (Elijah).

faith instead of the commands of Matthew, the promise is for believers generally instead of for the Apostles alone, and the gifts are conceived of as miraculous and healing powers, and that in a mysterious and partly apocryphal form.¹

To this mass of contradictory New Testament accounts are to be added two extra-canonical ones. The command to preach to Jews and heathens was in the second century developed into a formula that met the claims of both and soon became very popular, namely, the Apostles were to labour twelve years in Jerusalem and Israel, and then go among the nations. The promise and gift of the Spirit to the disciples was supplemented by the assumption of a Gnostic initiation of the eleven Apostles, but chiefly of the leaders, Peter, John, and James.²

We come, finally, to the way in which Jesus parted from his disciples. The whole of the New Testament sources, with the exception of the Acts of the Apostles, have in this point, notwithstanding all their contradictions in other respects and their unhistorical interpolations, saved their original adherence to fact—they say nothing about this parting, and only permit a disappearance of Jesus to be imagined.³ This is seen in venerable form in

¹ Mark xvi. 15—18, comp. above, p. 318. Πᾶσιν κρίσει, *lekol haberiut*, phrasis Judæis usitatissima, Lightfoot, p. 468. As to baptism in Mark, Volkmar (p. 619) thinks that Mark mentions in the second clause only faith and unbelief, in quite a Pauline manner, since Paul, though he retained baptism, did not regard it as necessary to salvation and attached no importance to this external rite. How ludicrous is this exposition with reference to Mark, how erroneous with reference to Paul! We could dispense with such New Testament theology. Moreover, Volkmar (p. 618) finds that Mark here gives the baptism of the heathen as something that Jesus had said to Paul at his last appearance! The five promises in Mark, (*a*) power to cast out demons, (*b*) the gift of tongues (1 Cor. xiv. 1), (*c*) power to control serpents (Rom. xvi. 20; Acts xxviii. 3 sqq.), (*d*) drinking poison with impunity (thus Justus Barsabbas, according to Pap. ap. Eus. 3, 39; see Anger, p. 262), (*e*) laying on of hands for the sick. Critics, from Schleierm. to Strauss, have held these traits to be apocryphal, but they are characteristic of Mark. Verbally repeated, *Acta Pil.* A. 14.

² Twelve years, *Præd. Petr.* ap. Clem. *Strom.*, comp. Clem. *Rec.* 1, 63. Eus. 5, 18. The impartation of the *gnosis*, from Clem. *Hypot.* Eus. 2, 1, and *Vita Const.* 3, 41, 43 (according to which all the Apostles were initiated in a cave on the Mount of Olives: μῦθον τ. ἀπορρήγων τελετάς). Comp. also Lact. 4, 21. According to Cod. *Pist. Soph.* Tisch. I. p. 410, exeuntes terni in quattuor climata cœli prædicarunt ev.

³ In a grandiose manner it is asserted not only by Krabbe (p. 532), Hengst. *l.c.*, and Pressensé (p. 657), but even by Bleek, II. p. 519, that the other New Test.

Matthew, who places the appearance of Jesus upon one of those Galilean hills where he had so often lingered, and in the air of freedom and near heaven had spoken this new and eternal gospel of humanity; and we may think either of the Capernaum hill of the Sermon on the Mount, or of the Mount of Transfiguration. But Matthew, satisfied with a mere suggestion, is altogether silent as to whether Jesus ascended from the summit of the hill into heaven, or whether he went away as he came. In a grand manner, he leaves us standing under the continued influence of Jesus's last utterance, which reveals his power, his will, his eternal inseparability from his followers and from the earth.¹ The same impression is given, though much less forcibly, by John, who, though Jesus had once spoken of a visible ascension, knows nothing of such an ascension, since he differs from Matthew in thinking that Jesus was already exalted to heaven.²

Luke's Gospel and the close of Mark exhibit, though in a commendably reticent manner, the transition to a material ascension. The former relates that on the evening of the resurrection Jesus led his disciples out to Bethany, his quarters at the last festival time, lifted his hands to bless them, and in the act of

authors have conceived the ascension quite in the manner of Luke. In particular, John is said to have indicated in vi. 62 (*θεωρεῖν*) a visible ascension, in support of which appeal might be made to Rev. xi. 12. As if this (comp. Lücke) was not the same mental seeing as in John i. 14, 51; 1 John i. 1; as if, further, John had not, in xx. 17 (above, p. 312) expressly represented the ascension as a secret of Jesus. In order to explain the silence of John, many have had recourse to the convenient expedient of supposing him to have been satisfied by the narratives of his predecessors (Mich., Fritzsche, and others, comp. Hase, p. 283, d). But Krabbe (p. 533) asserts that the resurrection without the ascension would be null and void, and then in the same breath—like Olshausen, and Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 107—he says that John did not regard the ascension as of so much importance as the resurrection. Here not only Schleierm., p. 508, and Bunsen, p. 474, but even Neander and Meyer, are more critical, since they attribute to Luke alone the materialistic mode of description (which, however, Ewald himself recognizes as fiction).

¹ Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 660, and *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 418, quite erroneously conceives of the coming of Jesus to the Galilean hill as a descent from heaven, into which error he might be led by Matt. xxviii. 18, 20; but xxviii. 7, 10, plainly shows the opposite. Again, Volkmar, p. 617, thinks of the terrestrial-superterrestrial Moses hill, and makes Matt. borrow this hill from Mark, whose original mention of the hill itself is only hypothetical.

² John vi. 62, comp. note 3, previous page.

blessing was parted from them. The latter reports that, after the words uttered on the evening of the resurrection in a chamber at Jerusalem, Jesus was received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God.¹ A description of the parting, of the departure, of the entry into heaven, having been once briefly attempted, it was no longer possible to resist the temptation to give a distinct delineation, a material view of the super-material, a visible assurance of the actual, indisputable ascension to heaven.² When Luke undertook the second part of his work, this plastic form of the ascension of Jesus—which certainly and quite conceivably had begun to gather shape before the destruction of Jerusalem, as the Revelation shows—was already found and readily told and re-told in the evangelical narratives that Luke now was very eager to make use of.³ From Bethany—so it was now said—or, more correctly and exactly, from the Mount of Olives which overhung Bethany, from the parallel to the Galilean hill, from the hill which was the witness both of the entry and of the arrest, Jesus visibly ascended to the upper world. This hill, now the footstool of the Messiah's ascension, had been spoken of as the scene of future miracles of the Messianic age, described in the form of divine ascensions.⁴ As soon as he had sketched the mission plan, he was suddenly lifted before the eyes of the disciples, then enveloped in a cloud, and in that visibly carried heavenwards. Then appeared once more the two angels of the

¹ Luke xxiv. 50 sq. But the words *καὶ ἀνέβη. εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν* are decidedly spurious, though they are characteristically defended by Bleek in order to support the material ascension. Schenkel, *Bib.-Lex.* III. p. 85, is also incorrect in saying that according to the Gospels Jesus ascended before the eyes of the disciples. Mark xvi. 19. *Barn.* 15, *ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς* agrees less (Hase, p. 283) with the more reticent language of Luke's Gospel than with the language of Mark.

² Ammon, *L.J.* III. pp. 497 sqq., does not speak amiss when he suggests that the representations of Matt. and John were intended for the more cultured readers, that of Luke for the people's church. At any rate, this is better than Schneckenberger's (*Urspr.* pp. 19 sq.) false charge against Matt.

³ Comp. Rev. xi. 12, a passage which, singularly enough, is not usually quoted in this connection, although the narrative of the two witnesses is evidently in part based upon the tradition of the life of Jesus.

⁴ Ezekiel xi. 23 sq., comp. Zech. xiv. 4; above, V. pp. 107, 111.

grave, not so much in order to complete the—still insufficient—evidence of the actual taking up of Jesus into heaven, as wisely to give to the idle meditating and gazing of the disciples a practical issue, to show that the actual history of the Apostles began from the Mount of Olives; and to this end the angels pointed forward to the similar return from heaven of him to whom the disciples must and could bring their labour upon earth.¹ No subsequent source could more vividly describe the ascension of Jesus; hence later descriptions, with all their wonderful blendings of the old sources, are formed upon this. The Acts of Pilate tells of an ascension from the Galilean hill Malek, in the sight of more than 500 Jews, unbelievers; and of the special observation of Jesus's actual entrance into heaven, and that in the midst of his last words. Less finely the Gnostics speak of a flying up to heaven; others fancifully of a progress through the three or the seven heavens. And the emperor's mother, Helena, in the fourth century, built the temple of the Ascension upon the summit of the Mount of Olives and near the cave in which Jesus communicated his last mysteries to his Apostles.²

Criticism has relieved us of the task of a troublesome adjustment between the Galilean hill of farewell and the Mount of Olives, an adjustment attempted sometimes in a crude and ludicrous way with the aid of two or several farewells or even ascensions, and sometimes by making the north point of the Mount of Olives the Galilean hill. It has also relieved us of a thankless, if pious, justification of a materially super-material ascension, the Jewish and apocryphal sign condemned by the

¹ Acts i. 1—12. The mention of the Mount of Olives instead of Bethany is one of the mass of differences between this representation and that of Luke xxiv. 50 sqq., differences which it is the custom to keep out of sight. Bethany lay behind and *beneath* the Mount of Olives. It was more than a Sabbath-day's journey, or 5—6 stadia, Acts i. 12, Jos. *Ant.* 20, 8, 6, and *B.J.* 5, 2, 3, namely, 15 stadia ($\frac{3}{4}$ instead of $\frac{1}{4}$ of a league) from Jerusalem, John xi. 18. If Jesus ascended from Bethany, he did not ascend from the summit of the Mount of Olives. Comp. Zeller, Overbeck.

² The Acts of the Apostles is the basis of Tert. *Ap.* 21; Lact. *Inst.* 4, 19 sqq., *Mort. P.* 2; *Acta Pil.* A. 14. The Gnostic Apelles (*ἀπέλλης*) in Epiph. *Her.* 44, 2. Through the heavens, Heb. iv. 14, vii. 26. The temple, Eus. *Vita Const.* 3, 41, 43. Comp. also Arnold, *Oelberg*.

words of Jesus himself; and finally from its worthy antithesis, Paulus's picture of Jesus vanishing in the mist of the spring morning upon "the high hill."¹ Criticism has shown that the visible ascension is one of the latest and most untrustworthy of the offshoots of the resurrection myth; and that, therefore, Christianity need not exhaust itself in struggles with the laws of the universe, of gravity, of the atmosphere and telluric attraction, or in explanations of the nature of heaven, which is to be sought, not in the mere clouds or in the blue sky, but at most only in the totality of myriads of individual stars. Nor need Christianity attempt to strengthen its convincing arguments by Old Testament myths of ascents of angels and men in flames and clouds and cars of fire, or by the discredited official proofs of heathenism concerning heroes and emperors who visibly ascended in the form of men or of eagles, quoted by Tertullian for the sake of comparison. We might almost say that, upon this point, the heathen paid the greater respect to the natural conditions of existence; for even the Apollonius myth, despite manifest imitations of the life of Jesus, was content with making the supposed theurgist, imprisoned by the priests as a sorcerer, after his miraculous self-deliverance appear at midnight to his foes, enter through closed doors, and vanish while the virgins were singing, "Go from the earth! Go to heaven! Go!"² It

¹ Among the attempts at adjustment, the *Acta Pil.* must be mentioned. According to B 14 and Lat. vers., the Galilean hill is itself the Mount of Olives. Later legend has given to the most northern of the three points of the Mount of Olives the name "Galilee" or "Viri Galilæi," which is said to be explained by the fact that the Galilean pilgrims went over this point to Jerusalem, whilst the Gospels themselves show the way by Bethany. A scientific justification has been attempted by Rud. Hofmann, *Der Berg Galiläa*, 1856, who would support himself by Tert. *Apol.* 21 (apud Galil. Judææ regionem) and Lact. *Inst.* 4, 19, as well as *Acta Pil.* 14; as if Tert. and Lact. would not *nude* call the district Galilee in accordance with the Matthew-tradition to which they gave the preference (Tertullian perhaps with some attempt at harmonizing), and as if the Gospels would permit such a meaning to be given to the word Galilee. Kinkel, *Stud. und Krit.* 1841 (comp. Hase, p. 277), thought of a series of ascensions. No better is the modern harmonistic, which locates the appearances at Jerusalem and Galilee, the ascension at Jerusalem (thus also Gess). Such attempts are the death of all criticism and exegesis.

² Comp. Paulus, *Handb.* III. ii. p. 921 (similarly *L.J.* II. pp. 320 sq.): is then the throne of the Deity vertically above the Mount of Olives? His natural explana-

can suffice to admit that this form of conception was once necessary, since, after the prophecies of Ezekiel and Daniel, and in accordance with the typical examples, Enoch, Moses, and Elijah, it was only in such a materialistic manner that men could assure themselves of the exaltation of the Lord to the right hand of God, and of his Messianic return "with the clouds of heaven." It must also be admitted that this form of conception, which was subsequently adopted by the Christians, received its finest, noblest, and worthiest expression in the representation by Luke.

tion (see above, IV. p. 311) was perfectly certain to him, because none of the spectators were *astonished* at this elevation from the earth (in truth only the assuming of an erect attitude).

Despair drove Kern (*Hauptthatssachen*, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1836, 3, p. 58) to the supposition of a divine accommodation, and the pious Steudel (*Glaubenslehre*, p. 323) to the supposition of a non-subjective vision. Comp. Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 653. Modern apologists now say that heaven is the place of the more intensive presence of God (Ebrard, *Himmelfahrt*, in *Herzog*, VI. p. 103), of the complete filling of the cosmical by God (Martensen, *Dogmat.* p. 299); they say the conception "above" might belong to the ancient world, but is a subordinate matter (Krabbe, p. 531); the entrance into heaven was of course not seen, but only communicated by the angels (Ebrard); the exemption of Jesus from obedience to the law of gravity is conceivable from the (now perfected, Olsh., Martensen) glorification of his body (Krabbe), and has its analogy in the flight of the eagle with bones and claws (Lange), whilst what was material in the body perhaps evaporated with the appearance of a cloud (Anon. in Süskind's *Mag.* XVII. pp. 165 sqq., in Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 621). Quite recently has Steinm., pp. 221 sqq., taken great pains with this subject: Strauss ought not, for propriety's sake, to have required thinking men to adopt his mythical explanation; even the more orthodox theologians, however, are lukewarm here, including Neander and Meyer; again, Quenst. and Olsh. err when they ascribe the exaltation to the pneumatical body, as does the ecclesiastical representation generally when, from the initial motus localis, from the point of invisibility to the entrance into heaven, it distinguishes a *species innarrab.*; the visible ascension occurred only by will, miraculous power; the invisible act, however, took place without movement, which belongs only to the sphere of visible phenomena, and the spiritual body is immediately at its goal! What a deal of toil of thought and belief, the absurdity of which is crowned by the admission that the whole apparatus of miracle proved nothing because the only evidence was the words of the angels! Was it then not sufficient, was it not better, in the sense of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 1 sqq.), entirely to dispense with the celestial signs? For instances of heathen apotheosis and ascents of men and divine messengers (Tac. *H.* 4, 83), comp. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1729 sqq.; Cic. *Nat. D.* 2, 24, *Leg.* 2, 8; Livy, 1, 16: Romulus hæc locutus sublimis abiit (he came from heaven: cælo repente delapsus). Suet. *Oct.* 100: nec deficit vir prætorius, qui se effigiem cremati euntem in cælum vidisse juraret. Sen. *De Mort. Claud.* 1. Dio C. 59, 11. Eagle, Herodianus, *Hist.* 4, 2. Tertullian, *Apol.* 21: in cælum est ereptus multo verius, quam apud vos asseverare de Romulo (is) Proculi (Livy, 1, 16) solent. Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 8, 30.

The modern Christian consciousness is mature enough to dispense with these pictures, and, without seeing, to believe, with the earliest accounts themselves, that the sphere of the departing Jesus was from the very hour of death the higher world of God.¹ And though the popular imagination is still most fascinated by the incomprehensible in a material clothing, the simplest understanding can in these days perceive that the ascension miracle, with all its pretence and all its audacity, is merely a miracle of illusion, because those that remained behind saw at most a few clouds, such as we can see now, and—despite the Acts of Pilate, a work which has much to say upon this question—by no means an entrance into heaven; because, consequently, modern Christians, compelled to give up thus completely the greatest miracle, must *believe* in Jesus's entrance into heaven simply upon the assurance of the angels, or better—like the Apostles themselves—on the evidence of their own spiritual conviction.² But though

¹ That the view of the Messiah coming with the clouds of heaven (Matt. xxvi. 64, comp. above, IV. p. 287) lies at the base of the picture of the Messiah going away in the clouds, is evident from Acts i. 11; indeed, Lact. 4, 21, not incorrectly finds in Dan. vii. 13, which underlies the whole, a delineation primarily of the ascension, not of the descent at the second advent: circumfudit se repente nubes eumque in cœlum sustulit, sicut *Daniel* fore ostenderat dicens: et ecce in nubibus cœli ut filius hominis veniens usque ad vetustum dierum pervenit. There may also underlie the popular view of the ascension of Moses, who, according to Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 8, 48, left behind the people and the elders and took his farewell of Joshua and Eleazar upon the mountain: καὶ προσομιλοῦντος αὐτοῖς ἔτι νέφους αἰφρίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ σῆμα ἀφανίζεται (though it is added, κατὰ τινας φάραγγος). On the other hand, the ascensions of Enoch (Gen. v. 24; Ecclus. xlv. 16, xlix. 14) and of Elijah (2 Kings ii. 11; Ecclus. xlviii. 9) are further removed; and the feature in the ascent of Elijah, referred to by Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 621, and *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 426 (comp. Ewald, VI. 3rd ed. p. 109), ἐὰν ἴδῃς με ἀναλαμβάν., is not imitated in Acts i. 9, βλέπόντων αὐτῶν; rather verse 11. Similar explanation also in Hase. On the contrary, Krabbe, p. 531. Christians also participate in the ascension, 1 Thess. iv. 15.

² Although Ebrard, *l.c.*, himself gives prominence to the unsatisfying nature of the report, yet, like Bleek, Krabbe, Lange, he insists upon the indispensableness of the visible ascension (which, according to Olshausen, Krabbe, and Ewald, appeared to John at least not indispensable). Krabbe, p. 531: without the ascension the resurrection would be without significance. Also Tholuck, *Glaubwürdig. der ev. Gesch.* p. 81, appears to despair without an external fact: where then did Jesus remain? Against these views, Hase, p. 281, whilst he at the same time maintains (p. 282) that Jesus departed from this earth in a way different from the ordinary one. De Wette expresses himself

the Mounts of the Ascension—the Galilean as well as that at Jerusalem—must be given up, it is enough that Jesus revealed himself in Galilee to his followers; that, by his life, death, and resurrection, he placed himself and his followers upon the mount from which, with Galilean, with Christian freedom, we can overlook the world and see heaven.

quite sceptically, writing upon Luke: a critical historical discovery of the underlying fact, which must still be reckoned among the mysteries of the Gospel history, is no longer possible.

DIVISION IV.—THE MESSIAH'S PLACE IN HISTORY.

A.—THE OLD AND THE NEW CONFESSION.

"THE originator of this appellation, Christ, was executed by the procurator Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberius." With this fact from the judicial annals, the great historian Tacitus, in the proud and contemptuous spirit of a Roman, introduces the history of the Christianity the sanguinary extirpation of which by the emperor Nero he is about to relate, and of the judicial persecution of which even to the sword under the emperor Trajan he approves.¹ To this unanimous condemnation of the Messiah of the Cross by both heathens and Jews the ancient Christians generally replied by pointing to the divine evidences of his veritable kingship which were exhibited even at the cross, to the miracles of Golgotha, and to the heavenly throne above the clouds.² But a stronger and more constraining evidence was discovered by Paul. As if he had had a distant presentiment of the arrogant judgment of the Roman against the "world-evil," the "shameful" religion of the cross and the gallows, in a laudable spirit of self-respect he begins his Epistle to the Romans with the words: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Jesus; for it is a power of God to Jews and Greeks, the creative means of the *Palingenesis* of the Roman empire and of all the world."³ What he anticipated and what he sowed, that have later men witnessed and reaped. From Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, to Constantine, the rejected Messiah of the Cross became the hope

¹ Tac. *Ann.* 15, 44 sq.; see above, I. p. 26. Very similarly, Just. *Ap.* 1, 13. Celsus, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 5, and 9 sq. Lucian, *De M. Per.* 11.

² Comp. 1 Cor. i. 23; Acts ii. 33, vii. 56. Tert. *Marc.* 3, 19: dominus regnans a ligno. *Bara.* 8: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰ. ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ. Fine reference to the wisdom that finds a place only in heaven, in Book of Enoch, 42.

³ Rom. i. 16.

of the peoples, and ultimately the standard of the universal empire, the symbol of the spiritual life of all nations, of all centuries. The dethroned Messiah has set up his throne in the history of the world, and after sixty generations that throne still stands, despite all the vicissitudes of earth. Towards its steps are directed, in innumerable melodies, the hymn of praise from the mouths of so many of the great and the little ones of the earth who have either undemonstratively loved, or, as poets and orators, artists and sages, workers and sufferers, have loudly and nobly lauded, in this person the richest gem of human life; and even the angry opposition of others becomes, against the will of those who exhibit it, the herald of his renown. Before this regal splendour all other earthly greatness pales; he himself and his life, these alone shine as the sun, brighter than the star-world of human homage, whose light he has himself kindled.¹

But the fervent sincerity of this confession should not lead us, under pretence of heroic, i.e. blind, fanatical, or servile faith, arrogantly to reject judgments based upon the calm investigation and keen discrimination of sober history. Let it be unreservedly admitted that the language in which Jesus was once praised has become strange to the present generation. And since the age no longer understands the old language but criticises and censures it, and in its censure of exaggeration itself exaggerates the contradiction and, while avoiding the past extravagances, ebbs into barren commonplaces, it may appear as if even this great figure is hurled down, as if even that throne had been shattered which a pious, short-sighted prejudice had set up for ever, with which was to endure the eternity of God and of mankind—of mankind the miniature of God ever rising afresh greater and nobler from the birth and death of *all* its individual forms. Yet the change of the language is no change of its subject-matter; and the difficult and endless pains taken to transform the old language into the new, reveals, if nothing else does, the importance and great-

¹ How has Jesus fulfilled what Celsus reproachfully demanded, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 30: as Son of God he ought, like the sun, to have revealed himself to the world!

ness of the fact which all the manipulations of friends and foes for two thousand years have not converted into wind-blown chaff.

The crisis which the person of Jesus brought about in human history may be briefly described by saying that, by Jesus, a higher conception and a higher personal form of existence of human nature have been acquired, and with this exaltation of the conception and character of man the old heathen, old Jewish limitations of divinity and humanity have been removed. Every glance into the venerable antiquity of Christianity shows that, while the presentiment of the noblest, overstepping their knowledge, reached the summit of the facts, their scholastic thinking, though apparently taking a high flight, actually sank weary and paralyzed at the foot of the facts. Where is to be found a more striking truth than the presentiment of the Apostle Paul and his followers in the New Testament, that Jesus had ended the enmity between God and man, that he had initiated a new covenant, introduced the spirit of divine sonship, that in him, the mediator of the new covenant, had appeared the mediator between God and man?¹ Or what is finer than Irenæus's words on the joining of God and men in the bonds of friendship and unity by the mediator Jesus; or Origen's picture of the interweaving of the divine and human natures; or Athanasius's brief confession of our participation in the divine nature through Him who became man?² But what fact gave and presentiment conceived was corrupted or paralyzed from the beginning by the scholastic doctrine which, apparently noble and lofty in idea but in reality the opposite, converted into a God the man who was called by God to weave the bond that united the divine and the

¹ Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18 sqq.; Col. ii. 14.—1 Cor. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14.—Gal. iv. 4 sqq.; Rom. viii. 15.—Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

² Iren. *Hæc.* 3, 18, 7: ἔδει τ. μεσίτην Θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων διὰ τ. ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρους οικειότητος εἰς φιλίαν κ. ὁμόνοιαν τ. ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν κ. θεῷ μὲν παρατῆσαι τ. ἄνθρ., ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸν θεόν. Orig. *Con. Cels.* 3, 28: ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἤρξατο θεία κ. ἀνθρωπίνη συννυφαίνεσθαι φύσις, ἵν' ἡ ἀνθρ. τῇ πρὸς τὸ θεϊότερον κοινωνία γένηται θεία, &c. Athan. *De Incarn.* 54: αὐτὸς ἐννθρώπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν.

human.¹ Both Jewish and Greek thought fed upon the antithesis, the eternal and painfully perplexing separation, of the divine and human natures; it nourished a famishing, hungering existence upon that antithesis which the religious consciousness of the man Jesus boldly and undoubtingly and joyfully broke down. Jesus called himself the Son of God, and was such by virtue of miracle, resurrection, and ascension: men, however, found it impossible that, as the Son of God, he could be man, but necessary that he should be God. The antithesis and the adjustment were extended to heaven: the Son was brought down from heaven, was held to be a celestial being really and visibly clothed for a time in human flesh. In this way men ennobled the humanity which the Son of God had visited and which he lovingly assumed; yet they nevertheless robbed it of its true history, of the true understanding of Jesus, of the real ground of consolation, namely, that he was its own, and that human nature, without any fiction of endless, mechanical, materialistic mediation, without addition or decoration, without transformation or mutilation, was capable in him and in all its members of the perfect indwelling of God. The historical investigation of primitive Christianity has incontrovertibly proved that the title of divinity, which already was conferred upon Jesus by the Apostle Paul and the Evangelist John, stood in the closest connection, not with the Greek cult of heroes or the Roman cult of emperors, but with that abstruse Jewish Alexandrian philosophy that sought to fill up the yawning gulf between God and the universe with intermediate existences and angels, to fill up the gulf between God and man, between that to which man was destined and that which he was, with the phantom of a spiritual, heavenly

¹ Hegelianism (comp. Strauss and Biedermann) objects to the doctrine of the Church mainly that it predicates of an individual what could be absolutely attributed only to mankind or to the principle of finity. According to this, the doctrine of the Church would be an extreme idealism, which is found expressed in the phrase: "God in the flesh!" Historically regarded, however, it was primarily the opposite, namely, scepticism, negation with respect to the rights of human nature, which were circuitously realized only by the intercession of the divine nature.

man, the likeness of God, in antithesis to the earthly man,—in fact, to fill it with the genuine *schema* of the Pauline celestial Christ.¹ Thus the ecclesiastical doctrine of the divinity of Jesus is the product of the mode of thought of the vanquished Judaism; and although it was for centuries the occasion of struggle after struggle, and—thanks to the extravagances as well as to the compromises of its adherents—ended with the infirmities and absurdities of dotage, yet the new age of the Reformation, the religion of the inner life, the religion of genuine and complete humanity, has left it standing on the old spot, in robust Lutheran form, a cheerfully accepted miracle.² The language of the Church, therefore, honours the Lord in this manner to the present day. But since the old tracks, formerly lawful because men knew no other, are now so thoroughly worn out that every man who ventures upon them falls to the ground if he thinks at all, the question arises whether we cannot tell of the universal greatness and sovereignty of Jesus in new and different language?³ Let us then, after all the individual inquiries of this history, place ourselves once more in the immediate presence of the mighty personality whom we have accompanied; let us seek to obtain a general impression, let us look clearly and keenly into this face, into these eyes, and endeavour to find what he is really in him-

¹ Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 4 sqq., 140 sqq.; above, II. pp. 47 sqq. These facts have recently been discussed or acknowledged especially by Beyschlag, Holsten, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath.

² Luther not only very significantly sang :

Not all the universe can hold
Whom Mary's womb does now enfold ;

but he expressly said : "Mary suckled and dandled God, made for him pap and soup," comp. Hagenbach, *Dogm. Gesch.* 5th ed. pp. 635 sq. Later Lutherans take up the same attitude; W. Löhe addresses Jesus : "Lord Jesus Christ, my Brother, true God and Man, Discerner of hearts," &c. *Rauchopfer*, p. 224. A new construction of this doctrine was also hindered, in the Reformation period, by the vicious efforts of deniers of the divinity of Christ, as, e.g., Ludw. Hetzer. Comp. my article on Hetzer in *Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* 1856, pp. 215 sqq.

³ Spinoza, from his absolute standpoint, described the *assumptio humanæ naturæ* on the part of God as an absurdity similar to the assertion *quod circulus naturam quadrati induerit* (*Ep. ad Old.* 21). Modern thought has also protested against the *assumptio Dei*, in the interest of man, of man's nature and freedom.

self and for us, according to the evidence of fact and not of prejudice.

B.—THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS TO HIMSELF.

First of all, what has he himself, the most appropriate and best-informed witness, said about his work and his person in relation to the Deity and humanity, and to the course of universal history? There is no doubt that, notwithstanding the great humility which he always exhibits towards God and the divine law, he makes great claims. Though he recognizes the ancient revelation as of perpetual validity, though he often represents his own new revelation of the Father to be a primitive truth accessible to every one from the days of the creation, he is nevertheless undoubtingly conscious, and in exalted moments of self-examination and self-disclosure he admits to himself and to others, that he knows God more profoundly and more truly than did Moses and the prophets, nay, that he knows God in a unique and unsurpassable manner; that he has discovered an easy and rest-producing yoke of piety contrasting strongly with the oppressive burdens of the Scribes; and that by words and deeds, from the novel miracles of his power and compassion to his sacrificial death, he has initiated for his people, whose unconditional obedience he yearns for, that prosperous condition of the golden Messianic age for which, out of the obscure past, the Old Testament saints had eagerly longed.¹ As for himself, he boasts of no equality with God, not even of a divine origin; he never desires worship for himself, but always only for God; he places himself with men under the omnipotence, omniscience, wisdom, and goodness of God, admitting in all these points the limitation of his own human capacity, and thus by anticipation putting to the blush the towering, deifying expressions of after centuries. Yet he knows himself to be, in his understanding, in his life, in

¹ Matt. xi. 25 sqq., xii. 28, xiii. 17, x. 32, 37; comp. more in detail, above, IV. pp. 15 sqq.

his actions, a master exalted above all past, present, and future, the final messenger of God, and more than that, the well-beloved, the Son of God above all sons, in the knowledge and fellowship of whom the Father finds satisfaction, as he in the Father.¹

C.—THE CONTRIBUTION OF JESUS TO RELIGION.

If by the side of these assertions about himself—which, diminished by some and magnified by others, in a welcome manner lift, though they do not altogether remove, the veil from the enigma of this character—we place the testimony of his history, the latter brilliantly confirms and completes the chief points of what Jesus has said of his work.² It is beyond all question that the leading features of *his* religion are the most precious and the most enduring acquisitions of the human mind. God the Father of

¹ Comp. above, IV. pp. 53 sqq. Scholten reckons it an evidence of superiority in Mark that he does not usurp for Jesus the specific name Father, *Aelt. Ev.* p. 185. How finely this more than Straussian rationalism purges the Gospels! Adoration to be addressed to God, Matt. vi. 24, comp. iv. 10, xxii. 21. The *προσκύνησις* addressed to Jesus (Matt. viii. 2, &c., comp. above, IV. p. 169, n. 3), is no adoration, even when no refusal of it—as on the part of the Apostles, Acts. x. 25 sq., comp. xiv. 15; Rev. xxii. 8 sq.—is reported. The Apostle Paul held essentially the same position. Adoration to be addressed to God, Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 20, xiv. 25; Rom. i. 8 sq., xiv. 11. Jesus is called only Lord, 1 Cor. viii. 6, never God, not even in Rom. ix. 5, despite the fresh attempt of Schultz, *Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* 1868. 1 Clem. 20, 32, 43, 58, notwithstanding a very advanced Christology, still limits the doxology to God. Invocation addressed to Jesus, 1 Cor. i. 2 (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 8); Rom. x. 12. Similarly Acts vii. 59. Even in John. iv. 21, comp. xvii. 3, and in the Apocalypse, see Rev. vii. 11, xxii. 9 (at the same time see v. 13, xxi. 22). But with Paul invocation naturally passes over into adoration, Phil. ii. 10; comp. Rom. x. 12, 13 (Joel ii. 32), xiv. 18. The Bithynian Christians, A.D. 112-13, *carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt*, Pliny, *Ep.* 10, 97, a view which harmonizes, not with the contemporary first Epistle of Peter, but with the somewhat later writings that exhibit a higher Christology, Hebrews, John, Ephesians, 1 Clement, Barnabas. The last goes so far as to find in the Son of God the co-creator of the world (5, 6), and to deprecate the human name, the titles Son of David, Son of Man (12). Interesting controversy between Franz Davidis and Faust. Socinus at Klausenburg, in 1578 (Baur, *Dreieinigkeit*, III. pp. 144 sqq.). The Sintenian controversy at Magdeburg in 1840 unimportant, Hase, *K.G.* p. 576.

² On what follows, comp. what I have said upon the person and work of Jesus in my *Gesch. Chr.* 3rd and 4th discourses.

man; man akin to God by nature and the beloved ward of God; every human life an existence of eternal value and of eternal destiny; the genuine service of God purity of heart; brotherly love without measure; the tie that binds men co-extensive with the race; even terrestrial matter no stumbling-block to piety, but a mirror of God, a sphere of joy and enjoyment, of bidden and unbidden labour; the family a sanctuary; a man's vocation a praise; the state-law a right; the cultivation of wisdom and of art a glorifying of God: this religion, without adornment and modernizing, understood and experienced as it stands in letter and spirit, is in truth the highest and last word that has been spoken upon earth, and is ever commending itself afresh as a constraining necessity to those who can neither dispense with piety nor, with all their thinking and contriving, find anything truer, more spiritual, more moral, more human.¹ If it is not enough to mention the fact that the world has until now lived upon this religion, and that every bold attempt to better the world—when it has not preached a total subversion of accepted principles—has been satisfied with petty patchwork on the basis of the great antiquity, without showing even a shadowy outline of a third teacher to follow Moses and Jesus; if it does not suffice to mention this, we may yet find our confidence established by the important confessions which thinkers and poets, down to Goethe, Schiller, and Hegel, and which even foes, from the angry Celsus down to the embittered Platonists of the fourth and fifth centuries, not to mention recent names, have brought as rich and reverential offerings to the religion of Jesus, and chiefly to its doctrine of divine humanity, its foundation of true human sentiment.² When we recall its symmetrical combination of

¹ Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 191 sqq.; above, III. pp. 118 sqq. Also Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, 15th ed. pp. 460 sq. (fine sentences on the Christian idealism, *ciel des ames pures*). Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 276 sqq., II. pp. 436 sq. Also Baur, *Church History*, Eng. trans. I. p. 37, recognizes in an admirable manner the popular glory of Christianity.

² Goethe, *Letzte Gespr. mit Eckerm.* III. p. 373: let intellectual culture advance as much as it may, let the natural sciences grow in perpetually increasing extent and depth, let the human mind expand itself as it will, man will not surpass the elevation

philosophy and popularity, of religion and morality, of humility and pride of freedom, of idealism and realism, of recognition of the claims of both this world and the next, of internality and tendency to external expression, of passivity and heroic action, of loving retention of the old and most daring reformation, who can exhaust its praise? Even Strauss, despite the many vacillations of which he can be shown to have been the subject, repeats almost against his will the first principles of the school from which he went out, and again and again acknowledges the possibility of proving that no age will be able to surpass Christ in relation to religion, consequently in relation to what is highest; that in every case among those who have advanced the human ideal he stands in the first rank; that religiosity showed itself fully developed in him, and that any advancement and completion of what already exists can contribute only sand-grains to the eternal edifice of which Jesus laid the strong foundation-stone.¹ Zeller has similarly expressed himself.² But the numerous objections which Renan, notwithstanding his readiness to see in Christianity the completion "in many respects" of all religion, has taken the trouble to collect against the beautiful

and moral culture of Christianity, as they glow and shine in the Gospels. Schiller, in his correspondence with Goethe, on the 17th of August, 1795, writes: The peculiar characteristic of Christianity (contrasted with all monotheistic religions) lies in nothing else than in the abrogation of the Law, of the Kantian imperative, in the place of which it would place free inclination. It is, therefore, in its pure form, the exhibition of beautiful morality or of the incarnation of the holy. The expressions of Hegel in Strauss, *Streitschr.* III. pp. 76 sqq., *Dogmat.* II. pp. 215 sqq. The Platonists are mentioned above. Celsus recognizes the harmony of Christianity with the teachings of the philosophers (comp. Tert. *Ap.* 46: eadem, inquit, et philosophi monent atque profitentur), Origen, *Con. Cels.* 5. 65; 6, 1; particularly the superiority of the teaching of the oneness of God, 8, 12 sqq. He is also on the scent of the Christian teleology, of the doctrine of the divine care, of the nearness of man to God, and he rightly connects these things with the Old Test.; indeed he is violently angry about them, 4, 23 sqq. Neo-Platonists, in Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 19, 23: sapientes Hebræorum, quorum unus iste etiam Jesus fuit, a diemonibus pessimis et minoribus spiritibus vetabant religiosos, venerari autem magis cœlestes Deos, amplius autem venerari Deum patrem.

¹ Strauss, *New Life*, l.c. Comp. the extracts from Strauss's *Streitschriften* and *Friedl. Blättern*, in *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 186 sqq., 193 sqq.

² On the perfectibility of Christianity, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1842, pp. 49 sq.

errors and the one-sided propensities of Jesus, against his enthusiastic, morbidly exalted, revolutionary principles,—these objections, some of which with a more prudent selection Strauss has repeated, melt away before the sources and the facts, and have already melted away in our hands.¹

Yet it behoves us to be cautious as to details, and to avoid those exaggerations which have hitherto so seriously obscured the historical picture of Jesus as a whole. We repeat here, with reference to both friends and opponents, what was stated in the beginning of this work, that the perfection of the new religion of Jesus lies principally in the province of piety, and by no means in that of secular matters.² Jesus was as little acquainted with the Copernican system as with the principles of modern medicine, therapeutics and psychiatry, or the theories of modern politics. In these provinces he was as little productive for himself and mankind, as in art and science.³ Here, therefore, Renan and Strauss may to some extent be permitted to speak of his ignorance, one-sidedness, mistakes; whilst we must be permitted to reject unjust, nay fantastic postulates of a universally complete man, which the church has never taught and the advocates of Jesus's human standpoint could not reason-

¹ Renan, 15th ed. pp. 94 sq.: il a posé une pierre éternelle, fondement de la vraie religion; par là il a mérité le rang divin; une idée absolument neuve faisait par lui son entrée dans le monde; nous sommes tous ses disciples et ses continuateurs. Pp. 460 sq.: la religion de J. est à quelques égards la religion absolue. On the other hand, his ignorance of the world, of the laws of nature, pp. 41 sqq., brusque renouvellement du monde, révolution, rêves, enthousiasmes, hardiesses, progression croissante d'enthousiasme et d'exaltation, pp. 81, 120, 127, 262, 320, &c. Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. II. p. 437. See *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 188 sqq. Above, III. pp. 118 sqq. In the *Friedl. Blatt.* xxi., Strauss had found the beginning of the modern system of immanence, in the transference of the divine to this life under the supposition of its existence in the life beyond death; in his *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 278, the still remaining transcendence is treated as a weakness. Comp. Zeller, *l.c.* p. 48.

² Comp. Schleierm. *Christl. Glaube*, II. pp. 30, 35 sqq.; *L.J.* pp. 100 sqq. My *Gesch. Chr.* p. 191. Above, II. p. 198; III. p. 121. Also Pressensé, pp. 352 sqq.

³ Schleierm. *L.J.* pp. 118 sq., speaks of Jesus's ignorance of the movement of the earth round the sun (Matt. v. 45, xiii. 6); and of electricity (p. 116), and complains of the "tremendous outcry" against it (p. 119), as generally against the idea of national development (p. 12). Also Strauss, in his *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 358, mentions the Copernican system.

ably put forth. We must be permitted to confine the mission and the work of Jesus to religion, to repudiate his mistakes with regard to inherited and not independently begotten conceptions, and to find the alleged one-sidedness of the man of religion legitimate and in part—since Jesus, in the breadth and liberalism of his range of vision, excluded nothing human and no future progress—non-existent.¹

The case is certainly different with the questions and objections in the specially religious province, than it is in the territory of secular matters. Yet though the fundamental religious conceptions of Jesus are enduring, eternal, and superior to the limitations of a single period and of a single ancient history, in more than one point even in the sphere of religion he has been compelled to pay tribute to the age and to the slow mental progress of human development. Whilst some have been expressing their assent to, and others their want of confidence in, the grand total of the teaching of Jesus, this is a special province which has been somewhat neglected; and it is a remarkable though explicable fact—because, namely, critics have in so many respects modernized Jesus—that this ground has been much less trodden by Renan and Strauss than by the earlier Rationalism. We refer to the Judaism—the “Judenzende,” as Semler said—in the teaching of Jesus, the transitory Jewish element in the midst of the permanent and eternal elements that had been growing up among the Jews for two thousand years, and were

¹ Renan, 15th ed. pp. 41 sqq. Strauss, *New Life*, II. p. 438, I. p. 358. Wittichen, pp. 195 sqq. (no idea of the State). The above limitation, with prominence given to the traits of susceptibility and spontaneity, after Schleierm. *Christl. Glaube*, II. p. 38, *L.J.* pp. 118 sqq., 123. On the other hand, Zeller, *l.c.* pp. 36 sqq. The liberalism of Jesus, *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 191 sqq. Strauss's self-contradiction upon this point (*l.c.* II. p. 438): not only is completeness of treatment lacking, but also the correct idea (of State, trade, art). *Yet all these complements* (by Greeks, Romans, development generally) *fit best upon what is provided by Jesus*, if we conceive of the latter as a human acquisition, and consequently as both capable of and needing further development. Exactly the same idea held by the second class of Schleiermacher's perfectibilians, *Christl. Gl.* II. p. 32: the community of doctrine and of life, derived from Christ, has (despite its defects), by virtue of divine guidance, such a *felicitous organization*, that doctrine and life are easily transformed according to any more perfect ideal of later generations.

concentrated and perfected in Jesus in a single life-time.¹ Of course the difficulty does not exist for those who, following Schleiermacher, think they are able to make the older Gospels fully harmonize with John, or, even in case of mistrust against John, to hunt up grounds of suspicion against the purity of the older tradition.² They adhere to that kind of investigation which has not courage to wrest and pervert with modern hardened audacity, or in certain circumstances to tear to pieces, the most ancient evidences that lie clearly and copiously before them, and are attested by the whole history of primitive Christianity.³ The idea of God with the heavenly throne, with the angels and guardian angels, and with the one-sided world of miracle breaking through terrestrial law; the idea of the Messiah, with its materialistic colouring; belief in a kingdom of the devil, and in a Jewish terrestrial rule, in a sudden and early end of the world as it is, in two terrestrial periods, in a second advent, judgment upon earth, and resurrection; the conviction of the literal inspiration and prophetic character of the Old Testament, and the retention of the Mosaic Law, of Jewish restrictions; the divine commission of war against the angels of the devil in the possessed, and of the blood-sacrifice in death for sinful humanity;—these threads among the conceptions of Jesus are undeniably interwoven and saturated with the Jewish spirit, and what one would prefer to regard as merely innocent interpolations are ultimately seen to be fundamental elements, the

¹ Comp. on Semler, Zeller, pp. 14 sqq. New Testament theology, in its beginnings, thought of the separation of the eternal and the temporal; comp. on Joh. Phil. Gabler, Baur's *N. T. Theol.* p. 8.

² Comp. what Schleierm., in his *L.J.*, has said on Jesus's attitude towards the Schools, p. 114, the Law, pp. 311 sqq., the Old Test. generally (Prophets), pp. 123, 139 sqq., 263 sqq., political expectations and theocratic particularism, pp. 140, 273, 315, demonology, pp. 333 sqq., &c. Likewise Weisse, saving Jesus's freedom from mistake, on his attitude towards the Law, pp. 377 sqq.

³ Of some of the Judaisms in the Gospels it may with certainty be said that they did not belong to Jesus, as, *e.g.*, the apocalyptic element in Matt. xxiv. But who can venture to find such inconsistencies in the teaching about the Law, with the numerous and original sayings which are mutually complementary and are still further complemented by the apostolic age? This against the attacks of Gess, pp. 208—269.

good and genuinely Jewish material of which immediately becomes evident.¹

In order to break the point of this objection to the teaching of Jesus, in former times critics invented the explanation which has been strongly supported by Semler, namely, that of accommodation. As God in the Old Testament descended to the meagre ideas of the age of the childhood of the race, so Jesus brought down his teaching to the level of the understanding, of the imagination and power of conception, of the prejudices and partialities, of his disciples and his nation; but in doing this he has nevertheless purified and illuminated this lower intellectual world as much as possible, and both explicitly and implicitly infused among the popular ideas upon every point the corrective of a higher spiritual exposition.² Even in the present day recourse is had to this explanation, not with reference to the general question, but to details: thus in this way one explains the Messianic confession of Jesus, another his description of the future, a third his legalism, and a fourth his belief in demoniacal possession.³ This exegesis is so far correct, that Jesus made touching and increasingly earnest efforts to adapt himself to the understanding of his hearers, as the parables most clearly show; and that our Evangelists themselves make special mention of

¹ On the relation to the Old Test., comp. above, II. pp. 182 sqq.; *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 12 sqq. On the exposition of the Old Test. in the spirit of the age, Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. pp. 357 sq. But even Schleierm. p. 123: conceptions which Christ delivered as already a part of public opinion, and not as his own. P. 140: form of the religious consciousness of the people. P. 266: methods such as a public teacher must use.

² Semler, in Zeller, p. 18. Other literature in Winer, article *Jesus*.

³ How often Schleierm. refers to this position, that Jesus, as a public teacher, must speak thus and thus, comp. p. 266. Of the demonology he says: it is impossible that any one should *protest* against everything that is not his opinion; for what would come of that? Among recent critics, Schenkel must be specially mentioned. P. 166: he had assumed the title of Messiah only by means of a not too comprehensive accommodation to the conceptions and expectations of his countrymen and his contemporaries. Yet he transformed the idea. P. 259: in describing the second advent, he availed himself of the language currently in use in theocratic circles. P. 67: he did not look upon it as his mission to enlighten his contemporaries as to the superstition of demoniacal possession.

this. Mark, for example, telling us that Jesus spoke as the people were able to understand, and John making Jesus say that he had still many things to say, but the Apostles could not understand them until later, until after his departure and the coming of the second messenger of God, the Holy Spirit.¹ But these facts exhibit at any rate only the extremely popular character of his mode of teaching, and at most—if John is to be admitted as a witness—a deliberate reticence upon the most difficult questions.² If, on the other hand, not only the form but also the matter of the communications of Jesus, not only the withholding but also the positive giving of information, are reckoned among the accommodations of Jesus, it will become apparent whether by thus doing the injury is not increased which it is sought to diminish.³ Perhaps in this way we should get rid of the temporary conceptions of the Son of God; but we should also morally sacrifice him himself, because, while we should leave him absolutely silent about any such accommodation, we should make him assume the appearance of being perfectly in earnest and of making statements that were completely valid, we should make him guilty of a simulation of ardour, of trustworthiness, and to some extent of such an enthusiasm for the very propositions in question as he felt only, e.g., for the Law; and in this way we should make him do what would have fully justified the theoretical and moral doubts of his teaching as a whole, indeed of his actual character.⁴

Schleiermacher has adopted a more subtle expedient. He has spoken of a national element in the development of Jesus, of communications of his higher consciousness in conceptions

¹ Matt. xiii. 10 sqq., 51; Mark iv. 33; comp. Matt. x. 19, 26; John xiv. 25 sqq., xvi. 12, 25, 29.

² John the first propounder of the perfectibility of Christianity, on the ground of the developments of the apostolic and post-apostolic times, as well as on the ground of his philosophical dogmatic, comp. above, I. pp. 152 sqq.

³ Comp. Zeller, p. 41.

⁴ Comp. such passages as Matt. v. 17 sqq., xxiii. 23, xii. 25—29, or xvi. 16 sqq., 27, xxvi. 64.

which he appropriated to himself out of that province, and of the characteristic marks of that province in transactions which were potentially predetermined by it. Schleiermacher held that the true humanity of Jesus was destroyed by the denial of this dependence of his development upon his surroundings. His nationality of character did not affect the peculiar principle of his life, but only the organism or the form of his life and of his ministry; it was not the type of his spontaneous action, but only of his susceptibility to intellectual influence; it consisted in a reception and propagation of conceptions without investigation, without forming his own and an erroneous opinion, without any responsibility, which remained attached solely to the originators of those conceptions; and it should not be too nicely, too harshly regarded as an isolating or exclusive principle in him, but should always be considered in connection with his most expansive and unclouded capacity for appreciating the human and the divine.¹ On the ground of this nationality of character in Jesus, a perfectibility of Christianity can be assumed, inasmuch as Jesus was hindered, by the imperfection of language and of circumstances, from fully realizing in definite conceptions and actions what lay deepest in his spiritual nature; and an advance beyond his historical manifestation would be in reality only a more complete exposition of his most characteristic and most intimate nature, and his essential perfection and originality would thereby be neither destroyed nor menaced.² Schleiermacher's "Life of Jesus" has afresh taken up and defended these views of his "Christian Belief" against orthodox attacks; and in more fully discussing them he sometimes approaches the doctrine of accommodation, and sometimes, and that more especially, exaggerates the elevation of Jesus above the national conceptions in an idealizing direction. He nevertheless adheres to the proposition that there was a time when Jesus was essen-

¹ *Christl. Gl.* II. pp. 35, 38, 81. He also excludes from Jesus the one-sidednesses of the schools and sects, *L.J.* p. 114.

² *Christl. Gl.* II. p. 32, where he gives this view of his as strange, but possible.

tially under the control of the national spirit, and again a time when his spontaneous activity developed itself, when he with his new principles possessed a dominating influence among men, though he still adopted many of those expressions which he found in common use, whether they were then correct or erroneous; in a word, that he himself did not therein err, since it was far from his purpose to defend the truth of such expressions with full certainty and with personal conviction.¹ This expedient of Schleiermacher's required a detailed recapitulation, because it has been a help to many, and because it approaches near to the actual truth.² That Jesus shared certain conceptions with his age is not due to a questionable doctrinal cunning on his part, nor yet to a personal intellectual narrowness; but those conceptions appear in him as the inevitable appendage to a ministry which, while it was historically limited by the fashion of a particular time, was otherwise superior to the time and dominates all times; and they have their analogy in the productions of other and smaller historical personages who surpass their own times in what is most peculiar to themselves, but in other respects speak the language and share or leave untouched the opinions of their times.³ This view, however, is wrecked at the same fatal point as the former one: if it can be shown that Jesus not merely assumed these religious opinions of his age, but independently advocated them with conviction and ardour, nay, that he used them as the supports and machinery of his own highest convictions, then the distinction between what was foreign to him and what was his own falls to the ground as fictitious, the

¹ *L.J.* pp. 12 sqq., 118 sqq., 123, 266, &c. The accommodation and the idealizing, above, p. 396.

² Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 187. Above, II. pp. 63, 67. Strauss, *Friedl. Blätt.* pp. 102 sqq. A. Schweizer, *Gl.* II. p. 33: perfect in the centre, if not in the periphery. Pressensé, p. 354, has so far adopted Schleiermacher's position that he not merely excludes from the conception of the perfection of Jesus all extra-religious knowledge, but also the specifically scientific branches of religion (criticism, chronology, ritual!); he possessed only the *directly* religious truth!

³ So far the objections of Strauss, 4th ed. II. p. 692, *Dogm.* II. p. 187, and of Zeller, p. 37, against the empty words and empty abstractions of Schleierm. are not quite conclusive.

opinions of the age become the deliberately arrived-at opinions of Jesus himself, and however high he may stand in other respects, here lies the finiteness of his view of the universe, here he has failed to go beyond the limits of his age.¹

To make this candid acknowledgment of the limitations of this religion is, however, by no means to admit the essential imperfection of the teaching of Jesus, or to say that Christianity itself must, in a rationalistic way, be degraded to a mere vehicle, and that an impure one, of pure rational belief,—as Schleiermacher blackly painted the opposite view.² Here it is above all certain, not only that what is eternal in the teaching of Jesus can remain while the temporary falls away, but also that this eternal element as such is the immediate criticism and vanquishment of the temporary. This vanquishment Jesus did in part himself immediately achieve, by advancing so far as to repudiate the limitation of salvation to the Jews; but for the most part he left the victory as a necessary and easy work to his successors. A man must be blind not to see, not only how God, interposing as the Lord of the universe even against the Son, condemned the human ideas of Jewish Messianism by the sanguinary teaching of the death on the cross, but also how Jesus himself, in the fundamental conceptions of his teaching, laid down everywhere the great premisses which by their crushing superiority were to drive the Jewish from the field and to introduce and establish the victorious and true conclusions of Christianity. The strongest bulwarks of Judaism—the Law and Messianism—though they

¹ On the other hand, Schleierm. *Chr. Gl.* II. p. 81, has spoken of the absence of error, Weisse, I. p. 378, of the infallibility of Jesus, which he (as to some extent also Schl. *L. J.* p. 370) found exemplified in Jesus's knowledge of the betrayer, p. 395. On page 378, Weisse indeed thinks that Jesus did not himself wish for the abrogation of the Law; thus no more can be said either of an infallibility of Jesus or of an intellectual greatness of his excelling everything that is human. Jesus then becomes a prophet and religious teacher like others, and it is only accident that has made him the central point of history.

² Thus essentially Kant, in his *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason*, 1794; Krug, in his *letters on the Perfectibility of Revealed Religion*, 1795; and particularly Röhr, in his *letters on Rationalism*, 1813, pp. 393 sqq. Comp. Zeller, *l.c.* pp. 21 sqq. Schleiermacher's black colouring in *Ch. Gl.* II. p. 32.

seem to stand, have long lain on the ground as breaches made by *his* prowess. This he has accomplished by laying stress merely on the moral truths of the Law and disposing of the Old Testament like one who has authority; by finding the Messiahship in his ministration and in the announcement of spiritual truth; and by lofty utterances concerning the organic growth through the length and breadth of the earth of the seed he had sown, and concerning the spiritual blessedness of belief and non-blessedness of unbelief, thereby renouncing the catastrophes of the second advent and the final judgment.¹ And does not the struggle with the kingdom of the devil become transformed in his hands into a struggle against sin and against the sacrifices of sin? And does not the blood-offering, that passionate act of a heart thirsting to do something even in its ruin, find its completion in the "firstling's faith" of the infinite compassion of the heavenly Father, and does it not dissolve into an undogmatic symbol of the Son of Man serving mankind while regardless of self?² Thus does he surpass himself, thus does he challenge us to find the completion of his teaching, not away from him in others, but in himself. He can be regarded as without error in so far as his intellectual equipment and performance stand on the level of his office of Saviour of the world; it is, however, as little to be denied that, not only as to the letter but also in reality, he was influenced by the limitations of his age.³

But why did he remain thus limited, while others are enabled by him to pass over those limits? We will not speak here of lack of clearness, of lack of decision, of lack of courage; but we have here to think of the extent of human power of performance,—for he was a man. The power which would not suffice to make its possessor a pioneer and completer in every domain of intellectual life, but only in religion, has fixed the limit even

¹ Comp. above, II. p. 185 (free use of Old Test.). Law, III. pp. 322 sqq., IV. pp. 24 sqq. Kingdom of heaven, III. pp. 60 sqq., IV. pp. 50 sqq. Son of Man, III. pp. 88 sqq.

² *Ib.* III. p. 237, V. pp. 323 sqq.

³ Weiss, p. 204, speaks in a similar way of the absence of error.

to religious achievement.¹ And this in two ways. It was not possible for him, in the span of a human life, all at once and thoroughly to permeate and enlighten the intellectual world that inherited the thoughts of thousands of years, with the new world of fundamental religious ideas that had sprung up in his own mind. And with a still gladder heart we say that his piety towards the nation in which he had grown up, and towards the ordinances of that nation, made it impossible for him to throw off the impressions of the ancient religion of God that had supplied the inspirations of his youth and had shaped his profoundly thoughtful manhood. Restrained by this piety, as is most strikingly shown by the conflict which took place in him between his dependence and his freedom as to the Law, the renovator of the world remained conservative, almost a restorer, in the midst of his boldest initiative. Little minds may charge him with halting half-way, although all great men have in their several spheres resembled him in this; to us it is enough that here also he was in all respects a man, and that his humanity was not such as to mar his greatness or to diminish the harvest of history; to which harvest it belongs, according to the divine government, that the seed shall be supplied gradually and well adapted to the weakly, immature generations, and that the present and every generation, to the last, is and shall be astonished at the inexhaustible plenty which, from one Sower, is pouring and will ever pour more and more abundantly, and of still purer and nobler quality, into the storehouse.

D.—THE PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF JESUS.

From the factual achievement of Jesus we must distinguish a *personal* one; from the founding of a new consciousness of God in the world, we must distinguish the manifestation and exhibition of the new religion in the domain of Jesus's life, a life which

¹ Comp. above, II. p. 188.

again was fertilized by that new religion itself, or more correctly was filled with the reciprocal intercourse, the action and reaction that went on between itself and its religion. The first great fact in the personal existence of Jesus is, that his whole being was constantly full of the idea of God in the sunny expansion of God into the Father; and the second great fact is the complete domination of the idea of moral good, which is indissolubly connected with the former as explanation and expression. It is usual to call the former his unbroken fellowship with God, and the latter his unsullied sinlessness.¹ And if there exists a possibility of showing both in him in full vigour, there can be no doubt that the lofty religion which he preached assumed flesh and blood first in his own person, and that in a unique manner because imperfection reigns in others. The church lives upon this belief; and this belief seems to be established, without need of further proof, by the fact that Jesus's religious preaching originated essentially in his personal religion, and his wonderfully lofty and spotlessly pure religion is therefore the outcome of the personal perfection of religious experience and moral practice.

Jesus's communion with God, however, was not without vicissitude and gradation, and did not lack consciousness of a permanent distinction between God and man. Mental absorption in God was followed—a fact implied in the idea of human and terrestrial existence—by engagement in terrestrial occupation of the various kinds which the world forced upon his notice or his intercourse with and calling among men demanded. And even his life in God exhibited the variations of momentary high-tide in inner revelation, illumination, perception, in the lifting up of the prayer that asked and obtained, in a blissful sense of oneness with God and of filial relationship to Him, along with a certain condition of ebb appearing prin-

¹ Schleierm. *Chr., Gl.* § 94: distinguished from all by the continual strength of his consciousness of God, which was a peculiar presence of God in him. He has therein included the sinlessness.

cipally in human deliberation and seeking, and in oscillation between human and divine voices.¹ But even in the most exalted moments, when he was assured of the infinite love of the Father, there was present to him the never-ceasing clear calm consciousness of the pre-eminence of God above and beyond even the Son, who though so near to Him never became quite equal to Him.² Should this limitation be, in the future, more strongly emphasized than it has generally been hitherto, the fact will nevertheless remain, that the expression of and impression produced by all the sources is, that belief in the Father and the consciousness of fellowship with Him filled Jesus's soul and every feature of his terrestrial life, as in the case of no other man; that the general belief in the favour of God and in his own great personal vocation in the name of God, was never in him—as in the most pious and even in chosen messengers of God—the subject of question and doubt for a moment, not even in his hours of weariness, not even in the outwardly and inwardly critical hours of distress and death; that, finally, out of the feebleness and hesitancy of every critical situation there sprang up again, without protracted oppressive pause, rest in, reliance upon, and ardour towards God, as a higher necessity, as the only natural conclusion, and after the testing and purifying influence of such tempests the Son's confiding cry to the Father was marked by a tone of increased intensity of consecration.³ Thus even these hesitancies not only betray human characteristics but

¹ On the first, Matt. xi. 25 sqq.; on the second, xvi. 23, xxvi. 37 sqq. The above sentences differ from Schleiermacher's dogmatic, according to which Jesus's consciousness of God constantly and exclusively determined every impulse, mastered completely and without a struggle the lower forces every instant, and permitted no depression from the recollection of former struggle, and no uncertainty as to the future, Schl. II. pp. 30, 36, 43, 71. Thus already the ancient Apollinaris: *οὐδέμια ὁσκησις ἐν Χριστῷ*, Ullm. p. 233.

² Above, IV. pp. 70 sqq.

³ Variations in the general certainty of revelation and vocation are to be found, not only in the cases of such characters as Mohammed, the Maid of Orleans, Ludw. Hätzler, George Fox, but even in the cases of the great characters of the Old Test., Moses, Elijah (comp. Jonah). This variation is nowhere visible in Jesus. It is therefore a crude assertion of Renan's that God was in Jesus as in others, 15th ed. p. 79.

also cover great victories; nay, every human characteristic that makes its appearance in this conflict and struggle, and in this perpetual, sober, chaste humility keeping in view the separateness even in the unity,—these results never violently achieved by means of obscure sentiment, ecstatic visions, and fanatical union with God,—these creature-limitations never deceitfully extended and overpassed,—these are the surest guarantee of the soundness, the truth, and the spiritual-moral reality of the new religion which Jesus discovered and which he was the first to exhibit in his own life.¹

The question of the sinlessness of Jesus, that is—if we would speak so as to avoid censure and to silence modern objections to the language used—the question of his moral perfection in nature and in achievement, has been from antiquity down to the present most copiously discussed in the interest of the belief in the atonement and the divinity of Jesus.² But here, more distinctly than in the mystery of Jesus's consciousness of God, the decision appears to lie before us in the well-known facts of his life: hence the copious register of testimonies of Jesus himself and of his friends and foes, of sayings and acts and impressions, collected by advocates and opponents. Certainly, since every party is able to adduce its evidences, it is clear that the facts and testimonies make up, despite the quantity of isolated matter, large—in all sorts of ways controvertible—totals; and that the definitive con-

¹ Fanaticism urged by Strauss, Renan, Geiger; a visionary life, by Weizs. and others. My *Gesch. Chr.* p. 173.

² On the literature, comp. Uhlmann, pp. 231 sqq.; Hase, p. 76. After Schleierm. II. pp. 34 sqq., 44 sqq., 78 sqq., are to be mentioned particularly C. Uhlmann, *Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, 7th ed. 1863 (foundation of it in *Stud. und Krit.* 1828); C. F. Fritzsche, *De ἀραπαρ. J. Chr.* 1835; Fel. Pécaut, *Le Christ et la conscience*, 1859; Dörner, *Ueber Jesu sündlose Vollkommenheit*, 1862; Herm. Weiss, article, *Sündlos. Jesus*, 1866 in *Herzog*, XXI. p. 190; G. Längin, *Sittliche Entwicklung Jesu*, 1867; C. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Menschen*, 1868, pp. 147 sqq.; Fréd. Godet, *La sainteté parfaite de J. Chr.* 1869. Comp. my *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 109 sqq., 174 sqq. Also above, II. p. 175. A writer in the *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1866, No. 32, speaks of the empty idea of "sinlessness." He will find that in what is said above, I go further (in comparison with most of those just mentioned) in the direction of a cautious conception (if he will have it so). Others will discover retrogression. The first denier of Jesus's sinlessness was Celsus, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 41: *μη̃ ἐίζας̃ ἑαυτὸν πάντων ὧ̃ κακῶν καθαρεύοντα.*

clusion is connected with the facts adduced by many more or less fragile threads supplied by prejudice on both sides.¹ Thus, perhaps, those who are led by the condition of the sources, by the relativity of human testimony, by the scantiness and insufficiency of the testimony of Jesus himself, to conclude that it is impossible to arrive at a positive decision, are nearer the truth than those who triumphantly glory in an opposite opinion.²

But we will examine more carefully into this subject. The often-quoted external evidences, the attestations to Jesus's innocence or legal rectitude by a Pilate, by a Pilate's wife, by a centurion, or even by a betraying Judas, are of little value even if they are genuine; for it is of importance by whom a man is praised, by what great or perfect authority on earth, more correctly in heaven, a man is pronounced holy or infallible.³ More valuable would be the involuntary and credible testimony of the Scribes to Jesus's unlimited trust in God, and to his unyielding and incorruptible truthfulness and uprightness; most valuable of all is the testimony of his companions the Apostles, who speak of him as holy during his life-time, and speak thus of him much more fully after his sacrificial death.⁴ This produces on the

¹ Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 264, yields to prejudice against Jesus's sinlessness: the conception of sinlessness is fatal to all historical (indeed, to all metaphysical) consideration.

² To the former belong Strauss, Pécaut, Hase, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, A. Schweizer, Krause; to the latter, Ullmann, Dorner, Godet, Weiss, and others. Ullmann, p. 35, is better aware of the limits of provableness than Dorner, who, pp. 16 sqq., expressly deduces historical certainty, though, p. 19, he is obliged to renounce mathematical demonstration. Hase, on his part, questions the objective provability, but substitutes a subjective one from the self-consciousness of Jesus, whose integrity is vouched for by objective evidence (p. 75). Also Witt, p. 147. But can a man both renounce and treat for what he renounces? Weiss, p. 202, repeatedly complains of a painful scepticism.

³ Comp. Matt. xxvii. 4, 19, 24, 54.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 43, xxii. 16.—Luke v. 8; Acts iii. 14, viii. 32 sqq.—2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. i. 4, v. 18, viii. 3; 1 Peter ii. 22; Heb. i. 9, ii. 17, iv. 15, v. 2, vii. 26, &c. It is easy to understand how this view was heightened by the thought of sacrifice, Rom. iii. 25; of the Messiah in heaven, Heb. vii. 26; Rev. ii. 18, 23, iii. 7; and of the predictions of the Old Test. (Isaiah liii.), Luke xxiii. 34; Acts viii. 32; 1 Peter ii. 24. Weiss, p. 197, went the farthest here when he found neither the belief of the disciples in the Messiah nor that in the Son of God conceivable without the impression of sinlessness.

whole a favourable impression, and yet, as has long been seen, it by no means goes beyond the similar testimony of Xenophon concerning his master Socrates, who is not therefore held to be sinless.¹ Moreover, on the other hand, the Pharisees inveigh loudly against the wine-bibber and companion of sinners, the lawless, the blasphemer, sorcerer, rebel, seducer of the people.² Hence we must listen simply to the facts of this life, resigning ourselves to the knowledge that such facts cannot prove everything, and that they certify the defects which are visible and tangible rather than the perfection which sits enthroned behind and above all that appears, even above the full measure of virtue.³ When we have considered everything, we shall find the facts justify a somewhat more modest opinion than is usually held.

To these facts belong, in the first place, the incidental testimony by Jesus to himself. Of the testimonies by Jesus himself upon this question, most are not strong as evidence, and others are very poorly attested.⁴ The most famous of these passages,

¹ Zenophon, *Mem.* 1, 1, 11, comp. Cic. *De Orat.* 1, 54 (sanctissimus); see *Gesch. Chr.* 116. Comp. Hase, pp. 74 sq.; Strauss, *Glaubenslehre*, II. p. 192. The impossibility of a sufficient amount of evidence concerning Jesus has been already mentioned by Weber, Bretschneider, Fritzsche, and others, see Ullmann, p. 61. What is to establish a difference in the testimony? Perhaps the Jewish observer was more strict, the Greek more cultured. Moreover, the superficiality of the Jewish idea of righteousness should be remembered; the *Zaddikim* of the Psalms and the Books of Job and Daniel, and the *Zaddik gumur* (above, III. p. 98), the perfectly righteous man of the Pharisees, must have been clean forgotten. Even Zechariah and Elizabeth are blameless, Luke i. 6; even a Paul is conscious of no sin, 1 Cor. iv. 4, with the exception of his persecution of the Church, 1 Cor. xv. 9. In humble recognition of sinfulness, cultured paganism can compare with Judaism, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 117; Ullmann, pp. 89 sqq.

² Matt. ix. 3, 34, xi. 19, xii. 1 sqq., 24, xxvi. 65, xxvii. 63; Luke xxiii. 2.

³ Since it cannot be assumed that Jesus could have been deceived concerning himself, like, e.g., the Psalmists, vii. 3 sqq., xxvi. 1 sqq., or Job xxxi. 1 sqq., it is incontrovertible—if one will proceed to absolute predicates, e.g. the objection of Krause in the *Prot. K.-Z.* 1864, No. 23—that Jesus withheld personal emotions and experiences, in the same way as the prophets and John the Baptist, and generally the great objective natures that live up to their vocation, among whom Paul also might be reckoned. Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 112.

⁴ Thus, from the words before the baptism in Matt. iii. 13 sqq. (above, II. p. 274), which are poorly attested, as little is to be inferred for sinlessness, as from the baptism itself against it. From the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 9, 12, comp. 15, and xviii. 35, nothing at all is proved as to a personal consciousness of sin in Jesus; he speaks for

the question, "Which of you convicts me of a sin?" is not merely confined to John's Gospel, but strictly speaking it does really exist, since according to the context the correct translation is, "Who convicts me of the fault of untruthfulness or of a lie?" a form of the question by which the ground covered is at any rate very considerably lessened.¹ Quite as little is a well-attested utterance of Jesus—that of the pardonableness of evil-speaking against the Son of Man—to be made use of in an opposite sense: it is not *his* weaknesses, but the misunderstandings of men, that make such judgments pardonable; and the forgiveness itself points to no fault of *his*, but in reality to misunderstood virtue.² The decisively weighty passage remains, therefore, the rejection, not of the title "Good Teacher," but of the inquiry after the good, because one is good, God, and of the inquiry after the source of the knowledge of good, which again is not himself, but the Law.³ There is here such a strong antithesis between the divine good and the good of the creature, that the two explanations are at least equally well justified, namely, either Jesus humbly denied the fact of actually perfect good performance by himself, or he simply deprecated the highest praise to real goodness, because that goodness was a struggling one, or because it was derived from a divine source.⁴

his disciples. Above, III. p. 339. Gloss on *Bab. Berac. (ib.)*: ne oret quis orationem (brevem) numero singulari, sed plurali. The cry of God-forsakenness cannot be supported. Above, p. 157.

¹ John viii. 46. Most recent expositors, including Lücke, translate simply "sin," and they may—against Origen, Kypke, Weber, who think of error—be right, in so far as *ἀμ.* in the New Test. never means error, as in the classics; but against Fritzsche's translation—deceit (comp. also Hase, p. 75; Schweizer, II. p. 93)—there is nothing to be objected from the standpoint of language, since deceit is really a species of ethical sin, and further it is in harmony with the context and the Johannine doctrinal conception, the idea being fully defined by *ἀλήθεια* and *ψεῦδος*, verses 44—46, 55. Hence the counter-proofs of Ullmann, pp. 56 sqq., are futile. Besides John, Luke can also be appealed to for a testimony by Jesus himself: in xxiii. 31, mention is made of green wood as opposed to dry. But can the passage be made to refer to absolute sinlessness? Finally, only an authoritative exegesis could find a convincing proof in Matt. v. 28 sqq., vi. 22 sqq., vii. 11, xi. 29, xviii. 3.

² Matt. xii. 32.

³ Above, V. p. 36.

⁴ The first, Strauss, *Dogm.* II. p. 192, Pécaut, p. 268; the second, Neander, p. 78, Ullmann, pp. 138 sqq., Dorner, pp. 12 sqq., Godet, p. 16, and my *Gesch. Chr.* p. 111.

If we bring to bear upon this obscure point all the light that the general conduct of Jesus affords, we see in the first place—in contradiction to the too definite and positive assumptions of Schleiermacher and his followers—that he confessed his severe struggles and his momentary vacillation between man and God, between “I will” and God’s will, between flesh and blood and spirit, as also his fear and shrinking in the presence of his solemn and sanguinary task; and we see in the next place that he was ever afresh admitting the permanent limitation of man in contrast to God as to the goodness of his work.¹ Expositors are prone to lay stress upon the distinction drawn by Jesus between himself and “evil men,” and in doing this they entirely overlook the fact that, in a number of places where he sets the physical and spiritual powerlessness of man, the weakness of thought and of moral ability, the paltriness, restrictedness, and untruth of human views, in contrast to God and the divine horizon, he reckons himself among men not merely as one of the human race, but as one of the actual men of daily experience.² Let us look next at the details of his utterances. “Salvation is impossible with men, possible only with God:” with these words of widest import he renounces for all, for himself as for others, not merely the capability of creating good in other men, but also the penetrating force of his own natural goodness and moral ability; he appeals to the divine support, which he is continuously seeking in prayer, to enable him to know, to do, and to suffer.³ His words to Peter, “Thou thinkest and willest the things of men, not the things of God,” and his Gethsemane words, “Father, not my will but thine be done!”—

¹ Matt. xvi. 17, 23, xxvi. 37 sqq.; Luke xii. 50. Schleierm. excluded any struggles. Comp. Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 57: the moral conflict of Jesus proceeded *solely* from the sinful world around him! Thus also Dorner, p. 8. More correctly Weiss, p. 203.

² Matt. vii. 11; and then v. 36, vi. 27 sqq., x. 28 sqq., xi. 25, xiii. 11, xvi. 17, 23, xix. 17, 26, xxii. 29, xxvi. 39 sqq.

³ Matt. xix. 26 (comp. xvi. 17). That this passage speaks not only of the men around him, and not only of his own inability to give them moral strength, but also of his own personal necessity of obtaining strength from God, is shown by xxvi. 40 sqq.

these utterances, in which the tones of human complaint (which some have missed) of weakness of moral desire and ability are faintly yet perceptibly heard, show not only an antithesis of inferior and superior; they show also that the tendency of human nature and of the disposition of the will in him, as in others, is not always and absolutely in the direction towards God, and that he forces the sacred rampart of God-pleasing virtue in part only by extreme self-denial, by heroic victory over his human nature, over his will, the resistance of which is betrayed to his hearers in the words of warning and fortifying rules of conduct, so many of which are the fruit of experience.¹ If it be urged here that Jesus, nevertheless, by himself and by God, by the divine idea or the divine power, overcame the sin that tempted him, achieved the sinless deed, consummated the holy passion in which he himself sought his perfection; yet, when all this is admitted, the fact remains that even in the person of Jesus nature and will were led on to the triumph of moral performance, not simply by their essential goodness, but by mastering the opposite of goodness, by violent resistance or indeed by the aid of God. In certain crises of this life we stand under the humbling impression of a never-quite-vanished dualism of divine and human will; we see the taming of the human will at Cæsarea, but we see also its renewed refractoriness immediately after the sacred vow and again in the actual hour of trial; we see this will at Cæsarea resolutely subjugated by the force

¹ Matt. xvi. 23, xxvi. 39, 42. Admonitions and warnings based upon experience, Matt. v. 28 sqq., xviii. 8 sqq.; comp. Job xxxi. 1 sqq. To derive everything here from observation of the impulses of other men is an abstraction, and an untruth against the personal admissions above described. Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 57, attempted this against me, and in doing it so far overlooked the identity of human nature in the Gospels, as to speak of supernatural procreation and the absence of the universal human endowment. Also Herzog, *Enc.* XXI. p. 204, expressively made the admissions of Jesus refer to the disciples, whom, however, he principally meant, and in admonishing whom he strengthened himself. Albaric, *Rev. de Theol.* I. p. 32: il nous paraît impossible sans cela (without sinlessness), que cet état n'eût pas transpiré de quelque manière dans les paroles de J., qu'il ne lui eût pas arraché quelqu'une des plaintes si naturelles à l'âme du pécheur, qu'en parlant du péché il en eût parlé d'une manière fort objective, comme de quelque chose d'étranger à lui même, faisant taire ainsi en lui la voix douloureuse de sa propre expérience.

of strong conviction, but at last we see again the bowed figure of virtue, a dumb obedience, and the docility of submission.¹ In the face of the above, can it be possible to prove with positive certainty that this nature, which even at the highest point of its existence and vocation was the subject of a number of paralyzing impulses, was at any time, and particularly in youth, in childhood, before the spiritual exaltations of the Messianic period, led and forced into unbroken obedience to God; and have we information as to those times, either from Jesus or from others?²

The final decision is afforded by an utterance—closely connected with the foregoing—in which Jesus gives expression to his humility. Jesus often did honour to the wisdom of God that is above human thought and above his own thought. This expression of his humility resounds from the great confession of Sonship down to the events at Cæsarea Philippi and at Gethsemane.³ In his confession of Sonship, and essentially also in his passion-confession, he candidly avows that his views have been slowly ripened by the divine teaching of facts to the higher guidance, nay to the wisdom of that guidance. This growth from the imperfect, from the humanly impure in perception, to the perfect, the divine, is in and of itself a strong analogy also for the province of the will, which can in a similar though gradual way have exhibited a growth.⁴ Indeed, these two facts stand much nearer to each other. For the wisdom of God, to which Jesus adapts himself from the confession of Sonship to his cry in Gethsemane, is essentially not merely a higher knowledge, it is at the same time the good and holy ordinance of God. Therefore there was a time when Jesus did not comprehensively understand and realize in his conduct the holy thoughts

¹ How these struggles disappear—even though their “seriousness” be admitted with a word (Neander, Ullmann, Dorner)—if I only think of Ullmann’s p. 130, or Neander’s p. 555!

² Matt. xviii. 3, xix. 14, contain no direct self-testimony, and at most would not take us beyond Rom. vii. 9; comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11, xiv. 20. What is said about his youth, in Luke ii. 40—50, even if it be regarded as historical, does not take us so far.

³ Matt. xi. 25 sq., xvi. 23, xxvi. 39 sqq.

⁴ Comp. also Wittichen, p. 148.

of God, when he still, here and there, sought to build up the kingdom of God in a human and restricted way, guided by flesh and blood, and with sanguine national hopes. But if Jesus only gradually and approximately perceived the good and holy ordinance of God, which became to him a moral law by the guidance of God himself, what becomes of the proof that he always fully met the highest divine requirement? Recourse is here had by critics to the expedient of saying that he always met that requirement, or more correctly the relative divine requirement, according to the degree of his knowledge and to the range of his duties, and that from the beginning the Church has been reasonable enough never to deny, but has always taught, that Jesus increased in knowledge and in performance from childhood to manhood.¹ But who will prove in detail that his actual performance, measured by his knowledge, fully met at every time, in every case, in every punctilio, the divine requirement justified by the stage of development at which his nation had arrived, or fully corresponded to his idea of God and of what was good in itself? And who can verify it in view of the later severe conflicts, those evidences of an inner struggle even after the confessions, and in view of the complaints of the defectiveness and infirmity of human nature? Here it must be admitted that the assumption of an exceptional moral infallibility appears to be ultimately based, not really upon historical evidence, but upon dogmatic surmises.²

Notwithstanding all the preponderance of moral conquests and excellences, the actual facts of his moral life, like his confessions, also reveal at isolated points the existence of human limitations. The writer has elsewhere charged the critics of this life with taking pains to extort from the life traces of human stains.³

¹ Thus Schleierm. *Chr. Gl.* II. p. 37. Ullm. pp. 101 sqq. Dorner, p. 5. Press. p. 325.

² Thus in Schleierm., Weisse, and followers. Besides the dogmatic surmises, there is also a number of historical ones. To them belongs the assumption that Jesus could not otherwise have called himself Son of God, judge of men, or sacrifice for the sins of men; comp. below, p. 419, u 1.

³ *Gesch. Chr.* p. 111, to which also Godet appeals.

This position must be retained in the presence of so many weak evidences, among which are to be reckoned particularly the repentance-baptism, more correctly the righteousness-baptism, by John, and the history of the temptation; and especially the frivolous arguments urged by Celsus in support of his charge of whining fear and cowardice, and by Renan in support of his charge of vanity or of the use of impure means to a holy end.¹ At the same time, from the other direction, Schleiermacher's assertion that an erring man must also have been a sinner, may be unhesitatingly given up as erroneous.² Finally, we must renounce the making capital of defects which only the fourth Gospel introduces, and that arbitrarily, intending to set forth the exaltation of Jesus in contrast to man by means of a series of exaggerations.³ Less confidently, two facts court rejection, although they stand in the closest connection with the highest virtue, with a choleric zeal for God, and with an heroic struggle even to blood against the foes of the Good. One of these facts is the passionateness

¹ Besides the history of the temptation, &c., Pécant appeals to the history of the Gadarenes, the fig-tree, the words to Mary, John ii. 4. As to the baptism, even the new exaltations cannot lead to a supposition of a repentance-baptism in the case of Jesus (therefore, according to Beysschlag, p. 57, a new-birth process). Comp. only Matt. xviii. 12 sq.; Luke xv. 7. Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 9; above, p. 19. Renan speaks of vanity which made him pleased to be admired, led him to create for himself increasingly lofty titles, made him tender and miraculously-helpful towards believers, but passionate towards others (15th ed. pp. 256 sqq., 338). He also speaks of artifices of superhuman knowledge (p. 169) or ability (fraud in the case of Lazarus); and suggests the uncomfortable principle—illustrated in the catastrophe of France in 1870—that the world is willing to be deceived, pp. 262 sqq.

² The formation of a judgment which in any way determines the manner of acting—so says Schleierm. *Chr. Gl.* II. p. 81—always presupposes either a precipitateness that can have been produced only by foreign motives, or an obscured sense of truth which, grounded in universal sinfulness, is in the individual case connected with the sinfulness of the individual. But whilst it is psychologically true that there is an intermixture of moral factors in the execution of judgments arrived at; on the other hand the function of judging is absolutely independent, and the error lies primarily within the territory of human nature and force, not within that of morality. Comp. also Witt. p. 149.

³ Hereto belongs the system of feigned questions, by which Jesus only too cunningly (Matt. x. 16) and somewhat ironically gives proof of his superiority to men, John iv. 7, 16, vi. 6; and the system of abrupt proposition of the most paradoxical doctrines and of *à priori* rejection. Above, IV. p. 300; V. p. 74.

which he—embittered, it is true, by futile labour and endless struggle—manifested here and there against the Pharisees and the people, sometimes even against his Apostles, as when, like John, he rejected the former without exception as blind and hypocrites, as seekers of power and of wealth, as wine-bibbers and revellers, in a word as the offspring of vipers; or when he spoke of the unbelief of Capernaum and of the towns of Galilee—in which so many, like his mother's household, kept aloof in a hesitation that, though indicative of narrowness, was worthy of respect—as even more damnable than the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah.¹ He displayed a passionateness of a different kind against Peter, whose offence consisted merely in deprecating Jesus's anticipation of his suffering by stammering, with human love and faithfulness, if also with short-sightedness, his "God forbid it." To this Jesus replied with a "Devil!" because he discovered the tempter—who was not Peter—in his heart.² But his passionateness was most strongly exhibited in the purification of the temple, as to which one might regret his straying, not only into violence and revolution, but also into a regard for religious externalism, which was foreign to him both before and after this. Even Luther has asked: "Why does the Lord have recourse to force, when he has hitherto done everything by his word? Is this not seditious?" And he has answered: "This act of Christ's is not to be used as an example; he did it, not as the minister of the New Testament, but as the disciple of Moses."³ This fine and correct saying of Luther's, who here, notwithstanding his natural pugnaciousness and violence, stands far above the delicate and insipid modern apologists, admits of an extended application. The whole of the last public acts of Jesus, the entry,

¹ Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. 1 sqq. 33 (zepha), vi. 1 sqq., xv. 1 sqq. (in these general terms not justified, comp. Gal. i. 14). The people, Matt. xi. 21 sqq.; the disciples, xvi. 8, comp. xvii. 17. Ullmann's defence, p. 144, against Pécaut (pp. 257 sqq.). Dorner, p. 11; Weiss, p. 203.

² Matt. xvi. 23.

³ Luther's Works, ed. Walch, VII. p. 1730. Hase, p. 76. Reimarus attacked this act with especial vigour; recently, Pécaut, p. 252.

the purification of the temple, and the many disputations, reveal the minister rather of the Old than of the New Testament, the disciple of Moses or the zealous Elijah-prophet, whom he elsewhere declared he was not.¹ With careful deliberation he chose this new theory and this practical way, because he found therein the last possibility of a victory instead of a downfall; but this breaking with his own principles of the quietude, spirituality, and gradualness of his kingdom and of the course of that kingdom, as well as the confused character of his activity in the last days, when Jesus passed from teachership to Messiahship, and then, as if helpless and bewildered, in reality recovering himself, turned back from Messiahship to teachership—these are signs of a strange, novel, passionate excitement and feverish unrest, that find their explanation only in the terrible pressure of circumstances, and in the impairing influence of those circumstances upon the exemplary brightness and clearness of his mind, and upon the lofty certainty and stability of his will.² Here and there this passionateness stands connected with a striking harshness, a cold, icy transference of himself outside the region of the fundamental emotions of humanity; but this latter characteristic, apart from the above connection and in the absence of excitement, also appears as a fruit of the rigorism of principles which now and then unpleasantly lack the gentleness of Jesus's principles, nay the meekness and humility which he ascribes to himself.³ Illustrations of this are to be seen in his indifferent repulse of his mother and brothers, of the Baptist, of the

¹ Faint justification by Lücke, *Joh.* I. p. 536, and Ullmann, p. 135: prophetic punitive office! Dorner, p. 17: refutation of Matt. xxvi. 61! Längin, p. 108: unjustified, narrow-hearted private morality! How many objections are there left open? That even Jesus's opponents recognize the moral lawfulness of the deed (Dorner), is not correct in view of Matt. xxi. 23. In a still less tenable way has Boniface (against Pécaut) held that Jesus had a dispensation from the ordinary moral law; on the other hand, Dorner, p. 10.

² Comp. above, V. p. 121. Very significant is the mixture of pedagogic and non-pedagogic, in the last denunciations of the Pharisees; Matt. xxiii.; see above, V. pp. 206 sq.

³ Matt. xi. 29.

Canaanite woman, as well as, in another way, in his refusal of leave of absence to his disciples who wished to take leave of their friends or to perform the last offices for a dead father.¹ However, not only are these defects everywhere explicable, as notably the excitements of the last days, but they are in every case an exaggeration of virtue. He was choleric by nature and by race; but his passion was an excess of zeal and love, which sought to reach the goal, the divine goal, in despite of the bulwarks of opposition; and his harshness was an element in his strength of conviction and of principle which—as in Luther—we have to take with the rest, because the great task could be executed only by strength, and not by weakness.²

Though all this is admitted—reluctantly, yet admitted for the sake of truth—these creature limitations are far from diminishing the moral glory of Jesus. It is not with him as with the other great characters among men; with him, the facts, great or small, patent or hidden, are not for ever reminding us painfully of the distance of the actual from the ideal. Even where his history is related most simply and with least adornment, or where it is without great public features, but leads for the most part into the quietude of private life, even there the impression is more than one of dignity, it is affecting; no oppressive doubt obtrudes itself between the ideal which faith requires in him and his person; and however steadily and minutely we examine in order to arrive at a conclusion without any fallacy, we are still able to retain the strong and joyful conviction that it was Virtue herself that trod the earth in him, and that the dolorous confession made by antiquity of the impossibility of sinlessness and of the non-existence of the ideal of virtue and wisdom, found in him

¹ Matt. xii. 48 (comp. John ii. 4; but also Deut. xxxiii. 9), xi. 4—6, xv. 23 sqq., viii. 22.

² The explicability (Weiss, p. 203) is therefore to be admitted, but that is no absolute justification, which is to be admitted only in the case of the young man, Matt. xix. 16 sqq., whilst in several of the above excesses, violence is done to the vocation and purpose of Jesus himself (Matt. xi. 29), and to the susceptibility of men (Luke ix. 61, comp. Matt. xv. 12).

its refutation and its end.¹ In detail, a plenitude of virtues—zeal for God and love of man, self-respect and humility, bravery and self-denial; every virtue so full, the zeal so fervent, the love so melting, the heroism so ardent, the self-denial so unbounded, that out of each atom a great man must grow. As a whole, a life-vocation magnificent in its conception, beset with inexhaustible difficulties and temptations, consuming in its daily onset, flooded with storm-waves at its catastrophe; and yet amidst it all the full man for the full task, growing with his labours and his experience, finishes in the disaster which He converts to success. All around, far and wide as we can see, there is no real serious defect to dishonour him and his vocation; in the hottest, in the most decisive hours of testing and purifying, there is a proven, if difficult, victory, the hard toil of which is itself to be ultimately explained from the highest moral motives, from the unyielding belief in the Messianic mission and destiny and in the paternal love and miraculous power of God, rather than from the limited measure of the force of human self-denial.²

Those who wish to retain the word “sinlessness”—originated by dogmatic—for history may do so. The life of Jesus, both in public and in private, was in an eminent degree holy and pure, and allows us as such to infer a previous unsullied youth striving towards the noble and the exalted. The small defects which have been detected are no sins; they are sometimes an extravagance of idealism and energy, and sometimes a remnant of human force in the crushing conflict of the elements, and vanish like a drop in the ocean of brilliant superhuman achievement.³ Or to

¹ A. Schweizer, *Gl.* II. p. 41: no disturbing defect, as, *e.g.*, in Luther; full force of the idea. Cic. *Tusc.* 2, 22: in quo perfecta sapientia, quem adhuc nos quidem vidimus neminem, sed philosophorum sententiis, qualis futurus sit, si modo aliquando fuerit, exponitur. Comp. Ullmann, pp. 88 sqq. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 117.

² Suffering as a purification, Luke xii. 50, comp. A. Schweizer, II. pp. 41 sq.

³ Similarly Weizsäcker, p. 438: this living entirely for the sacred cause, without human self-seeking and self-love, &c., this it is which can historically be called his sinlessness. Wittichen, *Idee des Menschen*, p. 53: withdrawn from non-Messianic aims in life, consecrated entirely to the new vocation. Schweizer, II. p. 87: Christ's

confine ourselves to human examples, who would venture to condemn as sins Luther's rough manner and his impetuous outbreaks? In so far it was possible only to Jesus's humility, that he should unreservedly place himself as he did, with the confession of human weakness in the face of divine strength, in the ranks of this race, so poor in performance. The truth was, that he, a real member of a weak, oppressed, discordant, wearily struggling age, was always conscious of the limitations of human nature and of its resistance to divine requirements; and, even though as regards ordinary virtue he possessed a good, willing, according to Strauss a Hellenic, happy, uncontentious nature, and never, like Paul, sighed for the strong moral nature from the future, yet in the colossal tasks which fell to him he was obliged to fight unto blood inwardly and outwardly in order to master nature and egoism, in order to storm the breach, in order to attain to and to exhibit in himself the man well-pleasing to God, the Messiah of God.¹ But a second truth is, that he attained to this; that,

becoming one with the idea of his vocation is the foundation of his sinlessness. Pp. 91, 93: the being fully possessed by his mission, by the Christ-vocation, with the infinite power exerted by that vocation upon the subject of it. Comp. Krause, p. 235. The critics already mentioned, as well as Neander, Dorner, Hase, and Weisse, have not excluded serious moral conflict, actual enticement of evil; Ullmann is content to transfer these to the imagination of Jesus. Purification and new-birth—which even Strauss excluded, *New Life*, Eng. trans. p. 283—are spoken of by Ewald, 3rd ed. V. p. 228, comp. Schenkel, pp. 44 sqq.; Strauss has spoken of many defects, of sluggishness and precipitancy, of which, indeed, even the best men have to complain, *i.e.* I. pp. 264, 282. On the other hand, actual sinlessness, even carried backwards to his birth, is thought of, not only by Ullmann, &c., and Beyschlag (*Christol.* p. 57), but also Weisse (I. pp. 280, 334); the former, Schleiermacher-like on the ground of divine miraculous creation, which from the beginning made sin powerless over him (*Schl. Chr. Gl.* II. pp. 33 sq.); the latter, without original higher equipment, by the blessing of a godly education and by his own persevering effort of will (comp. *Prot. K.-Z.* 1864, p. 52, and Beyschlag, pp. viii sq.).

¹ Strauss, *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 282, violently contradicts himself, notwithstanding that his remarks are in part both beautiful and correct. This cheerfulness, this equanimity, he says, this conduct springing from the pleasure and joyousness of a beautiful spirit, we may call the Hellenic element in Jesus. He appears from the very beginning as a beautiful nature, that needed only to unfold itself, but not *to be converted*. But, on the other hand, Strauss is not willing to exclude earnest efforts of self-conquest and renunciation, *vigorous exertions*. Only there were no violent crises. There peeps out the old Schleiermacher. Strauss's language has been repeated by many, *e.g.* Längin, p. 32; Wittichen, p. 149. Dorner, p. 8, places the harmony in

notwithstanding extreme humility and extreme severity in his moral judgment, he rose to that exalted point of moral self-consciousness where, despite the anguish of the individual conflicts, no paralyzing dread of failure in his moral task and no pang of sin any longer hindered and obscured his fellowship with God, where he, united with God, was conscious of victory, sure of his will, and above all, reposing in the love of God and for ever relying upon His help, assumed that exalted prophetic, and more than prophetic, position above the sin of the world, in virtue of which he, lofty as God the righteous, strictly judged that sin and his contemporaries, forgave sins in the name of God, held up his life as a pattern for all men, devoted his blood, as pure, to the atonement of the impure, and felt himself equal to the Messianic office of Judge of righteous and unrighteous.¹

Besides the plenitude of consciousness of God and the purity of moral will, a more or less absolute clearness of knowledge and an unlimited power of performance were early reckoned among the eminent features of the religious character of Jesus. If by these features we understand simply the religious outgrowths of that pious and moral fundamental consciousness

the youth, the conflicts in the teaching period of Jesus's life. The strongest support of Strauss's position is what Strauss has not noticed, Matt. xii. 33—35, comp. vii. 18. It is noteworthy that Jesus was never prompted to desire the kingdom of heaven, like Paul, by a feeling of moral-religious weakness, but only against his foes; that he found in the Law, not death (Rom. vii. 10), but life (Matt. xix. 18).

¹ Comp. Matt. v. 28 sqq., vi. 22 sqq., vii. 11, ix. 2, xxvi. 28, xvi. 27. From all these facts the most far-reaching conclusions in the direction of absolute sinlessness have been deduced. Comp. Weiss, p. 199. Witt. p. 47. But did not the prophets also punish sin; did not Nathan dispense the forgiveness of sin (2 Sam. xii. 13); did not Paul regard himself as a pattern (1 Cor. xi. 1), as a sacrifice, as a complementary sacrifice (the pure for the impure)? Phil. ii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 6; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 9; Rom. v. 7, ix. 3. Did Paul not think of the judgment of the world and even of the angels, by the Christians? 1 Cor. vi. 2 sq. And though critics, from Schleierm. down to Dorner and Längin, say that no trace of scar and no unpleasant recollections remained—a view supported by a remark of Strauss's in his *New Life*, Eng. trans. I. p. 264 (comp. also Schweizer, II. p. 52)—yet, notwithstanding the correctness of the view on the whole, the absolute, precise conclusion is a hasty one, for even Paul, despite all the delicacy of his moral susceptibility, in the consciousness of his then present condition (1 Cor. iv. 4), only very occasionally reproached himself with his past (Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 9), although he could remember Rom. vii. 7. Comp. also Phil. iii. 13 sqq.

which has been described, if by the knowledge we understand the possession, exhibition, and interpretation of the consciousness of God common to the race and of the consciousness of God peculiar to the individual, if by the power of performance we understand the bringing the influence of the religious mind and the moral will to bear upon the men around, who were psychically and physically necessitous yet related to and susceptible of the influence of him who was stronger, then there exists no reason why we should not assent to the above opinion. For we have long ago admitted the greatness of Jesus's religious knowledge, and the glory, nay the astounding prodigiousness, of his powerful works upon sinners and sick persons. On the other hand, all the facts of human nature, as well as the actual course of the history of Jesus, are left behind when, as has been customary in the Church, Jesus's knowledge is exaggerated into a divine omniscience, and his power of performance into a divine omnipotence.¹

Certainly, the Gospels paved the way for the belief in Jesus's omniscience.² Our very earliest Gospels tell of most minute predictions of suffering, death, resurrection; of disclosures of the nearer or the remoter future of the Apostles, Israel, Jerusalem, the unbelieving and believing heathen world; of miraculous insight into the inner lives of men, their conversations and transactions; even of a knowing what is taking place at a distance, as in the preparation for the entry into Jerusalem; and none has laid greater stress upon the establishment of these marvels than the late Mark and the still later John.³ But in the Gospels we can already detect the progress of the myth from less to greater; as when, in Luke, Jesus at his first public appearance at Nazara at once stretches forth his hand beyond the unbelief of the Jews to the heathen, or, near the close of his

¹ The *Clem. Hom.* 2, 6; 3, 11, &c., have spoken in unmeasured terms of the omniscience of the prophet upon earth, who, however, did not appear in Jesus alone.

² Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* p. 128.

³ Mark xi. 2 sqq., 14, 20, xiv. 13, 30, 68 sqq.; John i. 43 sqq.

life, describes to the Holy City the minutest details of the siege by the Romans in the year 70. We see it also when, in Mark, Jesus foresees the triple denial of Peter bounded by two cock-crowings; and when, in Luke and Mark, he describes in detail beforehand the ass of the entry, the servant of his host at Jerusalem with his pitcher, and the chamber of the Last Supper.¹ Or when one and the same incident in a triple form shows most clearly the progress from the natural to the miraculous, as when according to Matthew the disciples go to Jesus openly with a question prompted by ambition, according to Luke their ambitious thoughts are perceived by Jesus, and according to Mark these thoughts mysteriously become known to him from a distance, who does not detect the mythical exaggeration?² What these earlier Gospels began, that John completed. From the beginning to the end, Jesus is represented as seeing clearly his suffering and his glory, the attitude of the Jews and heathen towards the kingdom of God, the disappearance of the religion of the temple before the religion of the Spirit, the future of Peter and the black betrayal by Judas. He knows Nathanael before Philip finds him under the fig-tree, enumerates to the Samaritan woman her six husbands, knows of the death of Lazarus and of the day of his death, and from the first hour rejects the faith of the people of Jerusalem because he knows exactly what is in man.³

That a number of overdrawn details have obtained a lodgment in these descriptions is evident from the fact that the Gospels contradict each other, and yet more from the fact that they contradict themselves. Even this John, with his omniscient Son of God, is involuntarily compelled to admit incidentally the limitations of human nature—he still allows Jesus to be a

¹ Luke iv. 24 sqq., xix. 41 sqq.—Mark xiv. 30, 68, 72.—Luke xix. 30, xxii. 8 sqq.; comp. Mark xi. 2 sqq., xiv. 13.

² Matt. xviii. 1; Luke ix. 46; Mark ix. 33.

³ John i. 43, 48 sqq., ii. 19 sqq., 24, iii. 11, 14, 19, iv. 16 sqq., xi. 4 sqq., xiii. 1 sqq., &c. Equality with others is at least restored in the divine knowledge of the Baptist.

man—when Jesus is dependent upon hearsay for the knowledge of the hostile jealousy of the Pharisees that drives him out of Judæa, when he hears of the illness of Lazarus merely through a messenger, and knows the grave only when he is shown it; and the fictitious character of the description of Jesus's foreknowledge of his betrayal by the man whom he has chosen to be an Apostle, is most clearly revealed by the strong evidences of design and intention in the construction of John's explanation.¹ Still more candid are the others. They not only give the saying of Jesus, that God alone and not the Son of Man knows the day and hour of the future, and the other saying, that God alone perceives the hearts of men; but they also furnish, in their historical report, trace upon trace of the human limitation of Jesus's knowledge.² Of the machinations of his opponents and of the fate of his forerunner he himself obtained information at the time and determined his course accordingly; he became aware of the thoughts of his disciples, the evil intentions of his foes, the treachery of Judas, by means of their conversation and their behaviour, or by the reports of the disciples; he convinced himself by questions as to the understanding of his disciples and their disputes; and he made express inquiries concerning the opinion of the people and the disciples about himself.³ He was surprised by the faith of the centurion, of the Canaanite woman, of the woman with the issue of blood, and by the homage of the woman of Bethany, by the unbelief of Israel and its sages, by the incapacity of his disciples to understand and to act. In Gethsemane he was uncertain as to the ways of God and as to the fate of his disciples; on the Mount of Olives he was uncertain as to the time and circumstances of his second advent, and the sanguinary future of Galilee. Finally, after all the good faith of his commencements, he was painfully disappointed in

¹ John iv. 1, xi. 3 sq., 6, 34; Judas, vi. 70 (ii. 24, 25), xiii. 10, 18 sq., 21, 26 sq.

² Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xvi. 15.

³ Matt. iv. 12, ix. 4, xiii. 10, 51, xiv. 13, xv. 12, xvi. 13, 15, xxii. 18; Luke xiii. 31, &c.

Israel and Jerusalem, in Judas the Apostle, and in some respects even in other Apostles.¹

The evidence of the limitation of the knowledge of Jesus here lies before us in sufficient abundance and in a convincing form, and does not need to be strengthened by recalling those limitations of secular and religious knowledge that belonged to the age, and which we have already considered. The exaggerations of the Gospels are abundantly explained, in the case of the earlier Gospels, from the actual and astonishing impression of Jesus intensified by myth, by the title of prophet and by the Messianic idea; and in the case of the later ones, by the dominating influence in history of the idea of the God-equalling Son of God.² The greatest contribution was brought by the character and conduct of Jesus himself: his knowledge of God and of divine things, his understanding of men and even of nature, his insight into men's hearts, his clear judgment as to the future catastrophe—in a word, the calm certainty of the whole of his career, exhibiting a confidence in God which would look like a higher knowledge in the presence of the events, even of the storms of his life.³ There remain many other facts that are not to be

¹ Matt. viii. 10, xv. 28, ix. 22, xxvi. 10, xi. 21, 25, xvi. 8 sqq., xvii. 17, xxvi. 39. A hitherto unnoted self-deception is shown, not indeed by the announcement of death to John (against Wittichen, III. p. 45), but by the narrative of the lunatic, Matt. xvii. 17 sqq., see above, IV. p. 323, where Jesus first sought the guilt in the people. As to the destiny of the disciples, he thought of a danger to the faith not only of Peter but of all of them (Luke xxii. 31), of the possibility of their suffering and dying with him (Matt. xx. 23), of the possibility that Peter might not fall (Luke xxii. 31). Again, as to the kingdom of the Messiah, he placed thrones in view of the Apostles, Matt. xix. 28. With reference to the calamities of the future, he had a presentiment of the downfall of Jerusalem, but not of the sanguinary summer in Galilee (A.D. 67), although that lay nearer. He is in general certain as to the second advent; on the other hand, the incorrect predictions in the eschatological speech (Matt. xxiv.) are not to be ascribed to him. His changes and mistakes have been, against the indications of history, explained away by Ullmann, pp. 105 sqq.; Hofmann, *Erl. Zeitschr.* 1865; Herzog, pp. 204 sq.; Dörner, p. 45. Comp. above, IV. p. 298, n. 1.

² We are reminded of the miracle-myths of the knowledge of Old Test. prophets, and of the belief in the divine Searcher of hearts (Acts i. 24, xv. 8; comp. Rev. ii. 18, &c., where this, as well as other divine attributes, is already ascribed to the Messiah).

³ The conversion of penetrating discernment of men (Matt. ix. 4, xvi. 8, xxii. 18) into a miracle (Matt. xvii. 25; Mark ix. 33) is particularly evident.

denied—the daring hazard of the choice of the Apostles, the unmasking of his opponents, the detection of the betrayer, the putting to shame of Peter and the fugitive disciples, his certainty as to the nearness and the form of his death, especially his victorious assurance of the future of his person and his cause, and of the downfall of the powers that seemed to be his conquerors.¹ Yet all this, even the famous prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, more correctly of the temple, was due either to a natural faculty of presentiment, or to a cultivated sagacity, or to a world-historical self-consciousness; in a word, it was due to a human gift far less enigmatical and inconceivable than the gift of presentiment and prophecy that has appeared in all ages, particularly in Israel and as late as the time of Jesus among the Essenes. There is nowhere any proof to be found of a divine knowledge in Jesus.²

Still less was anything like omnipotence present because Jesus performed works of healing, or because the Gospel myth tells of a control over wind and water, and of a satisfying the hunger of five thousand; or, finally, because John introduces a creator at Cana, and at Jerusalem an invincible who throws Roman cohorts to the ground, and gives himself up because he wills to suffer, because it is necessary for him to suffer.³ The origin of these myths and of these exaggerations has been sufficiently dwelt upon; and the plain fact that underlies them is this, that Jesus—as John himself sometimes forcibly asserts—in his religious utterances was as one who had authority, whether he was teaching, calming fears, consoling, blaming, or giving

¹ On the scepticism of Strauss and others as to the prediction of his death, and as to the certainty of suffering on the last evening, see *Gesch. Chr.* p. 130. Jewish gift of prophecy, *Jos. B.J.* 2, 8, 12.

² Natural faculty of presentiment, Schleierm. *L.J.* p. 224. Presentiment of the downfall of Jerusalem also among the Jews, *Jos. B.J.* 2, 12, 5; *Ant.* 20, 6, 1; 19, 7, 4; 15, 10, 5.

³ Matt. viii. 26, xiv. 16; John ii. 7, x. 17 sqq., xviii. 6 sqq. Celsus thinks (Origen, *Con. Cels.* 1, 68) that if everything is admitted—healings, resurrection, feeding—Jesus was nothing more than any other magician. 2, 48: Says he not that others perform similar miracles through the devil?

commands against sin and evil.¹ He must be left in possession of this greatness; but he must be released from any other, and that so much the more because any other greatness would mar that which was really his. For he is great in that he remained conscious of his human weakness and powerlessness, that with his human nature he undertook the greatest task, engaged in the greatest conflicts, endured the most sanguinary suffering; and that he triumphed over himself and over the world, over minds and bodies, and over powers, by prayer to and confidence in the Almighty, to whom alone the impossible is possible. Nothing in the life of Jesus is more certainly shown in the Gospels than this powerlessness and this obtaining of strength through the Almighty, as John himself is compelled, by the facts of Jesus's life and by the universal wisdom which he propounded, again and again to show.² A soaring view, which would concede something but would nevertheless find everything possible to Jesus, and would restore to him a participation in the omnipotence of God by the circuitous route of faith and with an appeal to Jesus's right to demand twelve legions of angels,—this view is at once contradicted by the fact that he himself openly acknowledged the existence of a gulf between prayer and its answer, the impracticability of succour by legions of angels on the ground of the discord between divine wisdom and man's desire for preservation and his prayer of need; as well as by the fact that a petition which had for its object purity of spirit—the prayer for the steadfastness of Peter in his faith—found no immediate divine hearing.³

E.—THE PLACE OF JESUS IN HISTORY.

Without any of these additions, and with all the deductions which have been willingly assented to, the world-historical

¹ Matt. vii. 29; John vii. 46. Comp. Justin, *Trypho*, 102: ἡ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου ἐνναμῆς, εἰ' οὗ ἀνὴρ ἡλεγχε τοὺς συζητοῦντας αὐτῷ φαρ. On the other hand, before Pilate he practised ἐποχή.

² John v. 19—36, &c.

³ Matt. xxvi. 39, 53; Luke xxii. 32.

greatness both of the achievement and of the personality of Jesus remains undestroyed. But in our recapitulation, also, we must avoid the exaggeration that is so fatal, while we seek in our view of the person of Christ that union of Hellenism and Mosaism which reason and history require. The copious facts exhibit human dimensions, and are consistent neither with the antique assumption of a God in human form or of a deified man, nor yet with the modern Schleiermacherish substitute of an unmixed primitive human perfection.¹ Though it is true that the facts to some extent favour Strauss's well-known hypothesis—almost become a superstition—according to which an idea does not usually lavish all its plenitude upon one individual and deal sparingly with all others; though it is true that to some extent the division between the historical and the ideal Christ—which Christs do not mathematically agree line to line and point to point—is to be retained in the spirit of modern philosophy; yet it is these very facts that afresh confirm the forced, and therefore repeatedly overlooked, admission of the same criticism, namely, that with reference to religion Jesus remains to us the highest we know and are able to conceive, that in the domain of the inner relation of Godhead and humanity he has reached the extreme and unsurpassable stage of union, and that the anxious inquiry after something higher in achievement and in personal character must be relegated to silence as a dream and as a subtilty unworthy of a reasonable being.² The idea

¹ Celsus, Origen, *Con. Cels.* 2, 79 (in his usual style): *ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἦν*, &c. Ewald's rationalistic sentiment, p. 593; Son of God, as none before. The name God first in John i. 1, xx. 28; Heb. i. 8. About the same time among the Bithynian Christians *Christo quasi deo*, Pliny, *Ep.* 10, 97. Invalid proofs, Rom. ix. 5 (although still defended by H. Schulz); Eph. v. 5; 2 Thess. i. 12; Titus ii. 13, i. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

² More in detail in *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 185 sqq. The self-contradictions of Strauss, and his newly assumed hostility to the uniqueness of Christ, *ib.* pp. 190 sqq. Certainly to a Geiger, II. pp. 146, 202, the Straussian sentiments were dogmas or artificial fancies which fell before criticism much more easily than the old massive conception. What need of personality! Even Judaism (in itself purer) could dispense with Moses. Noack, in his already mentioned spirited *Leben Jesu*, II. p. 186, thinks: to the sons of our age comes the question whether we are to continue to see in Galilee, in A.D. 37,

of the perfected, holy, fraternal man, one with God and preserved spotless in the fiercest conflicts of life,—this ideal of the “second, spiritual man,” found by Paul in the soil of Jewish philosophy, has, by the spectacle of Jesus’s life, entered and matured in the heart of mankind; and in Jesus’s appearance, in his historical yet ideal person, it has become, for those whose judgment is just and not too exacting, an essentially blameless reality to which the faith of the best men looks with longing for the illumination of its own defective achievement, and whose limitation and higher stages the thought of the wisest has no hope of discovering.¹ For though it still remains that we see a limitation, the defect is infinitesimal in the plenitude of this human glory; and it is not *his* defect, but the limitation of human nature as God made it, a limitation which did not permit the struggling hero of religion, in the short span of this life, to dominate everything, even what was little, though the prejudice and the weakness of thousands of years fell into ruins before his master-work.

The question how Jesus could become what he was—namely, the herald of a new religion and the representative and expression of the ideal of pious humanity—falls to some extent out-

the intellectual sun by which the clock of the world’s history is to be set; or whether, having arrived at the Golgotha of a world-historical error, we may at once greet the morning star of day, &c. Passing over in silence such frivolous utterances, I would gladly refer to, besides Strauss, Ed. Zeller in his often-mentioned essay on the Perfectibility of Christianity, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1842, p. 43, where he says: We readily admit that the religious consciousness, subjectively regarded, reached its acme, the highest personal greatness, in the founder of Christianity. On p. 49 he admits, further, that the perfectibility of the race, even with respect to objective religion, is not unending, that therefore the appearance of an historical sufficing principle, not exactly at the close of the world’s history, is at any rate possible, whilst the realization of it in Christianity is to be decided by the philosophy of history, particularly by the philosophy of religion. Also Biedermann, *Dogm.* p. 691, while distinguishing between person and principle, says that the personal religious life of Jesus was the first instance in which that principle realized itself in an historical personality, and that this fact is the starting-point of the activity of that principle in history.

¹ Comp. A. Schweizer, *Christl. Gl.* I. p. 110, II. pp. 41 sq. On the other hand, Biedermann’s dogmatic (see previous note) has rather the separation of principle and person, by which the latter is deprived of its rights by being made merely the first and not the only person, and merely the ministering organ of a principle superior to it.

side the scope of this history, which describes facts and does not explain the enigma and mystery of human endowments. But this book must exhibit the visible and discoverable coherences, if it is to give a history in history, nay the history that boasts itself to be the central point and end of the religious history of the world. This close relation has been here recognized from the beginning; and there must not be at the end even the semblance of an isolation of Jesus from the general development of the world. This connection can be easily established as to Jesus's conception of the world, less easily as to the features of his personal life.¹

In Jesus's conception of the world there is, as he said, the new and the old.² He himself regarded it sometimes as an inheritance from Moses and the prophets or as a return from Pharisaism to the law of God, and sometimes as a revelation of God, unique for all the world, and yet not of essentially different origin from that by which God spoke in detail and individually to Peter and to the hearts of children. At the same time he has guarded his claim to and share in his own human performance.³ There is nothing to be said of peculiar mysteries in this conception of the world. It is its praise with some, and its defect with others, that it nowhere trespasses upon the province of the things of the other life, the things which have been and are still veiled to the human mind; and where these things are touched upon at all, Jesus merely repeats old or new Jewish teachings.⁴ The teaching of Jesus, where it has achieved the most, is essentially an exposition of the Old Testament out of the fulness of the human heart and conscience, a higher repetition, a "Deuteronomy" of Moses and of the human conscience, in which the con-

¹ As a rule, the gulf alone is shown or mentioned, as, *e.g.*, by Dorner, p. 44, whose expositions generally spring at once from the ground of history to dogmatic assumption, to the dogmatic superlative.

² Matt. xiii. 52.

³ Matt. v. 17 sqq., xv. 3 sqq.; xi. 25 sqq., xiii. 11, xvi. 17, xix. 11. His own work, xi. 27.

⁴ Matt. v. 34, xii. 25 sqq., xiii. 49, xvi. 27, xviii. 11, comp. xxv. 34, xxvi. 53.

science finds itself again with nothing foreign, nothing extra-human, nothing super-human. Just as we find everywhere in his very phraseology, the reverberation of the thoughts and expressions and argumentation of the Old Testament, and of contemporary teachers, so is the whole of this teaching the recapitulation, revival, and rejuvenation of the Old Testament.¹ The religion of Jesus is, in its eternal chief constituent, the belief in the Fatherhood of God; and, in inseparable connection with that, the belief in the religious and moral dignity of men. We have long since seen where lay the rich and blessed seed-field of these great ideas—in the venerable legacy of Moses and the prophets. Out of the Covenant God of Israel grew the Father; out of the dignity of Israel, the dignity of man; out of the national fellowship, human love; out of the theocracy, the universal kingdom of God; out of the law of the two tables and with an omission of the sacrificial statutes, the service of the moral act and of the heart.² This admission, which is forced from impartial critics by historical observation, does not diminish the greatness of Jesus. He is not less than Moses because he borrows from him the belief in the One God, or less than the prophets because he learns from them the service of the heart and of compassion, and the wide and spiritual kingdom of God. He is greater than they, because he has filled up the gulf between the One and the many which Moses dug and no prophet bridged over; and because, with the clear, almost completely effected separation of the spiritual element from the vigorous materiality of Mosaic and even prophetic forms, he has freed the Old Testament from itself, and for ever removed its fragmentariness, its obscurity, its contradictions, by fully developing its spirit.³ It

¹ Comp. *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 11 sqq., 71 sqq. See also above, II. p. 179, III. pp. 29 sqq., 292 sqq., 336 sqq.

² Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 16—18; Matt. v. 43, ix. 13 (Hosea vi. 6). The interesting fact that Celsus perceived the connection between the teleological views of Judaism and Christianity, has already been pointed out, above, p. 391, n 2.

³ It is well known that those very prophets that emphasized the law of the spirit still remained bound to the law of the letter.

must nevertheless be firmly maintained that the religion of Jesus derives from the Old Testament both its illustration and its complete explanation. The stubbornness of the contemporaries of Jesus, of the Jews generally, their blind zeal in perpetuating the materiality and the letter of the Law, would be but a poor proof of the impossibility of conquering the Old Testament by means of the Old Testament. And if examples are asked for, in the time of Jesus Hillel with his school, and Philo, even the Essenes, were at least on the same road. But it is enough to perceive the gradual progress from Moses to the prophets, from Hosea to the second Isaiah and to Jeremiah, from the last prophets to Jesus the son of Sirach and the Book of Wisdom, in order to see that the advance from the material to the spiritual, from externalism to internalism, from the statutory to the moral, from what is foreign to God to what is akin to Him, from the national to the cosmopolitan, had in every age its instruments to carry it on; and that the difference between beginners and finisher, workmen and master, does not suffice to exhibit, for the production of the religion of Jesus, more than merely the postulate of fully-prepared religious personality, nay, of complete novelty of creative divine announcement.

The question as to the religious personality of Jesus has to grope more in the dark. Is it a truth, or is it nothing but words, when this virtuous God-allied human life is called the noblest blossom of a noble tree, the crown of the cedar of Israel?¹ A full vigorous life in a barren time, a new building among ruins, an erect strong nature among broken ones, a Son of God among the godless and the God-forsaken, one who was joyous, hopeful, generous among those who were mourning and in despair, a freeman among slaves, a saint among sinners,—by this contradiction to the facts of the time, by this gigantic exaltation above the depressed uniformity of the century, by this compensation for stagnation, retrogression, and the sickness of death in progress, health, force and colour of eternal youth—finally, by the lofty

¹ *Gesch. Chr.* p. 71. The figure already in Ezekiel xvii. 1 sqq.

uniqueness of what he achieved, of his purity, of his God-nearness—he produces, even with regard to endless new centuries that have *through him* been saved from stagnation and retrogression, the impression of mysterious solitariness, superhuman miracle, divine creation.

None can escape this impression; but while one is pleased to isolate Jesus, another brings to bear upon him, as a problem, a thoughtful consideration which explains the impression, and by investigation of all the connected circumstances lessens the enigma. We must neither degrade the religion that was before Jesus to a mere shadow in honour of the religion of Jesus, nor in honour of his personality deny the embodiment of religion in the persons, families, and national life of Israel. We must not, by a harsh distribution of unqualified light and darkness over the defects of the unhappy transition period in which the life of Jesus fell, altogether conceal the realism of Jewish practical piety and the results of that piety. Such a procedure would not only be a defiance of history, it would be irreligious fanaticism, since the depreciator of the centuries depreciates also the God of history, the depreciator of Israel depreciates the God of Israel. Light is here thrown upon a dark subject by the perception that it contradicts all probability to explain the religion of Jesus as derived without miracle from the Israelitish religion, and yet to regard the personality of Jesus as a miracle altogether unrelated to anything else. The parallelism of these two questions is the more convincing, because reason and experience both make Jesus's view of the world the higher and more striking in comparison with the human personality that produced and was produced by it.¹ Moreover, this religion of Israel which was perfected in Jesus, being a theory of the world and as such a life-

¹ Jesus himself justifies this view when he places the kingdom of God, its possessions and duties, *above* his person, Matt. v. 10, xiii. 44, xix. 12, comp. v. 11, x. 39, xix. 29. The above is also justified by the separation of principle and person by Strauss and Biedermann. On the other hand, it is not insisted upon that *only this specifically constituted person* could bring the principle theoretically and practically to a victorious issue.

creating power, was engaged in the work of developing out of the imperfect man, the ennobled, purified, perfect man. This religion of divine covenant, of law, of will, of performance, never, not even in the times of backsliding, shrank into mere theory, mere profession, mere fancy or dreams of the future; it was, in the hearts and actions of the noblest, to the very periphery of the nation, a difficult problem of real life, of mastering and shaping the terrestrial world, a problem in the working out of which every force, every sentiment of honour and pride, zealously shared.¹ The unhappy period from Ezra to the Pharisees was more marked than any other by the impulse to do everything that would strengthen the country and the people and kingdom of God. The introduction of our History of Jesus has shown the strong effort, the conscientiousness, the growing spirit of enduring Israel the servant of God, and the epitome of this zealous struggling Israel in the noble, strong, blameless figure of the Baptist.² For the refinement and development of religious ideas there had not been wanting religious characters who, in the priestly service, had nobly exemplified these ideas in their lives. We have seen John. Philo also, living in the ideal heaven of his God, had steadfastly despised all the earthly allurements of illusive possessions and honours, although he never boasted of having attained to sinlessness. And Hillel, unreservedly devoted to God, consistent in the practice of his fundamental rule of love towards his neighbour, and unwearied in his deeds of charity and condescension, was followed to the grave by the lamentation of Israel: "Alas, the gentle one! Alas, the pious one, the disciple of Ezra!"³

Thus it is not as if all the lights had been extinguished when the star of Jesus and his personality rose upon the world. And if, despite the Straussian protest, Jesus really rose upon the world as a star before which all lesser lights paled, to which Hillel, and even John with his timid enslaving fear of God, and

¹ Zeal for God, Rom. x. 2; Galat. i. 14; Acts i. 14; comp. Mal. iii. 13.

² Above, I. pp. 299 sqq., II. pp. 215 sqq.

³ Above, I. pp. 281, 351.

Philo with his confession of earthly impurity, must yield, it is impossible for us not to see how powerfully the course and circumstances of the life of Jesus helped to raise him to that eminence at the foot of which Philo and Hillel and John were left standing.¹ From his birth, a Philo lacked the ancestral, simple, unimpaired faith; he lacked the discipline of the distress and resistance of the Holy Land, as well as the elevating and inspiring force of a great patriotic vocation. A Hillel, participating in the sorrow of Israel in the midst and at the crisis of the national misfortune, was cramped by the prejudice, the stagnation, the rigidity of party doctrine, the confined, heavy, turbid air of the school-room. Even John, as a Judæan and a priest's son, remained in the bonds of a severe, painful piety; and strong as his faith was, he had no forerunner, but only a successor who enjoyed the blue clear sky of Israel, the clouds of which had been scattered for him by the potent voice of the Baptist. Jesus grew up as a child of the people, of the Galilean people; his youth inhaled all that was holy, all that was lovable, in Israel, all the woes and all the thrilling hopes of a great past and a fermenting present, and wove for itself the warp of a new religion out of the good old faith and the new resolves and yearnings.² His mature years enjoyed even to the close the influence of the prophet of the wilderness, and of the vows of Israel unexpectedly and rising as one man at the call of its God, like the dry bones in Ezekiel's vision.³ Amid these surroundings grew the new religion, the faith in the God-Father, the holy disposition, the glad daring courage, the moral vigour and determination; in him grew up the belief in his destiny, in the bond which bound him to God and to men, and the solemn self-

¹ See *Gesch. Chr.* p. 190, on the Straussian protest against him who was not the sun, who was at most a star ranking with others, and could not call himself the light of the world without boasting unduly (*Matt.* v. 14).

² Beyschlag (*Christol.* p. ix) could here find Pelagian dreams that are refuted by the consciousness of every pious girl standing at the altar of confirmation. He sees merely that Jesus thought only a little more Augustine-like than he. Above, III, p. 95.

³ Ezekiel's great vision, xxxvii. 1 *sqq.*

dedication to the greatest achievement, to the most unsparing sacrifice. What began the sacred hour that created a great office out of the impulse of the heart, a lofty privilege out of the consciousness of what he possessed and of what he could do—that completed the work. With his increasing conception of his destiny, with his higher aims, grows the strong and the weak man: Jesus grew with his vocation, to which, with Israelitish faith, with Jewish energy, he determined to be equal, to which he was compelled to make himself equal.¹ His soul blended entirely with God, whom he served as instrument and representative; forgetful of self, he was zealous for the noblest cause; his heart flowed with fervent love for his nation, which he was to make great and prosperous; his thoughts were illuminated and purified under the daily direction of the wisdom of God; he drove from within him the spirits of pleasure and anxious care, of self-seeking and ambition, which he as Messiah would have to condemn and destroy in the nation, and he subdued himself to the point of being patient and self-denying even unto death. Amid such instigations and incitements, amid such creative forces, by which his pure will allowed itself to be determined, and by which his strong will determined itself without sinking beneath their greatness,—amid these influences, these tests, these successes, these struggles, which were sweetened to him by his growing self-reliance and by the delicious enjoyment of the world's spring, it was possible for him to become the great character that, notwithstanding the mystery surrounding him, surpassed all others, not in nature and essence, but by the length of a head, and now shines upon the world of humanity as a unique creation of God, daringly rejected but never to be reproduced.²

This historical explanation of the achievement and of the personality of Jesus by no means excludes a religious consideration of these subjects; yet the one-sidedness which places this life

¹ A. Schweizer, *Chr. Gl.* II. pp. 91, 93, gives prominence to the elevating influence of Jesus's call.

² *Gesch. Chr.* p. 108.

upon the miraculous ground that is absolutely cut off from all other mundane life, is to be most carefully avoided. But "everything is of God," says Paul: "what hast thou that thou hast not received; and if thou hast received it, why boastest thou thyself as one who has not received?"¹ The great forces of mankind are in truth the thoughts of God, and the developments of the world are the ways of God. It is a mere strife of words or a strife of sophists, when some explain the centres of history from nature and others from God.² Nature rests upon God, and the course of the world does so no less; and none has seen how the world lies in the bosom of God, or how far He rests from His creation, and how far He continues to create.³ We grope after the explanation of the universe: we perceive natural harmonies and relations, and we have a presentiment of a Lord above the chain of natural causes; since we find both, the breaking of one of them in pieces is the sport and passion of the child that cannot make his calculation come right.⁴ The crude miracle of exaggeration, with its ancient and modern evidences of miraculous birth, miraculous deeds, and miraculous fates, being given up, the history of Jesus still tells of a unique plenitude and strength of equipment that took the world upon its shoulders without breaking down under the load; of an infinite achievement that, within human limits, factually and personally placed before the eyes of men what was veritably perfect; finally, of a felicitous constellation, nay, of a constellation full of wisdom, in this solemnly calm rising of Christianity upon the world amid the co-operation of all nations, in this school of destiny Israel, in this education of Jesus from the Messiahship to the kingdom of the cross, and in this preservation of the indispensable until the foundation-stone of his church was laid. The Christian can and may without wavering believe in these gifts and acts of God, who does not allow Himself to be degraded to the mere spectator of the

¹ 2 Cor. v. 18; 1 Cor. iv. 7.

² Spinoza, *Ep.* 23: sed te contra rogare mihi liceat, an nos homunciones tantam *Naturæ* cognitionem habeamus, ut determinare possimus, quousque ejus vis et potentia se extendit et quid ejus vim superat?

³ John v. 17.

⁴ *Gesch. Chr.* pp. 143 sqq., 195 sqq., 127 note.

world's history or of men, as is taught by heathenish, godless, arrogant wisdom ; and what doubly fortifies the Christian is the impression made upon him by the strong conviction of the Great One himself, who announced gifts, revelations, and protective providences of God.¹ And since in his person, as contrasted with the imperfect products of his own time and of thousands of years, man and mankind are perfected, it is to-day still possible and reasonable to reply to vacuous objections : the person of Jesus is not only one work among many works of God, it is the peculiar work, the specific revelation of God ; yet not a work of pulling down, but of building up and completing the God-appointed order of the world. If Spinoza acknowledged him to be the temple of God in which God most fully revealed Himself, we may exclaim still more joyously that Christianity is the crown of all the creations of God, and Jesus is the chosen of God, God's image and best-beloved and master-workman and world-shaper in the history of mankind.² He is at once the repose and the motive-power of history : the noblest ideals of which the dawn of human development dreamt, for which the halcyon days of the earth yearned and strove in inspiration and sadness, have found their realization in him, have become a credible existence in flesh and blood ; and yet, again, he is a far-off, dimly-seen prize, which brethren and nations and generations are for ever striving after.³ To them has fallen the more modest lot of imitating the Great One, of portraying his nature, and of reproducing his ideas in the kingdom of the mind and in the world of existences. And under the banner of these ideals,

¹ Seneca, *De Prov.* 3 : ecce spectaculum dignum, ad quod respiciat intentus operi suo Deus : ecce par Deo dignum vir fortis cum mala fortuna compositus.

² Spinoza, *Ep.* 23 : atqui hoc summum est, quod Christus de se ipso dixit, se scil. templum Dei esse, nimirum, quia Deus sese maxime in Christo manifestavit, quod Johannes, ut efficacius experimeret, dixit : verbum factum esse carnem. Sed de his satis. The nova creatura, the novissimus Adam, the only tenable conception, first by Paul, 2 Cor. v. 17 ; 1 Cor. xv. 45 ; Rom. v. 14 ; recently, in particular, though with exaggeration, in Schleierm., *Chr. Gl.* II. pp. 26, 34, 45. Comp. Weisse, II. p. 495. Even Krauss, *Lehre v. der Offenb.* p. 324, after all his attempts has arrived at no other formula.

³ Comp. the admissions of Strauss and Zeller, above, p. 426.

under the standard of the man who, like God and unlike any other man, called a world of life from naught, there stand and fight even his shortsighted opponents, so far as they contend only for the honour and dignity of mankind, and for the victory of the mind over the tyrants of the earth, over nature and flesh, use and prescription, injustice and unreason. For in such a warfare, when it is honourable, He stands among them, because He and no other is and remains the appointed standard-bearer of the world's progress, who shall triumph over the quagmires and the spirits of darkness of the nether Kosmos.

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES.

MATTHEW.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>i. 1—17, II. 25.
 i. 18—25, II. 70.
 ii. 1—23, II. 82, 85, 90.
 iii. 1—12, II. 216, 227.
 iii. 13—17, II. 268, 274 sq.
 iv. 1—11, II. 300.
 iv. 12, II. 329.
 iv. 13, II. 347, 354, III. 137.
 iv. 15, I. 80.
 iv. 17, III. 40, 93.
 iv. 23—25, III. 17, 158.
 v. 1—48, III. 62, 100, 283.
 vi. 1—18, III. 328.
 vi. 19—34, III. 30, 109.
 vii. 1—6, III. 36.
 vii. 7—12, III. 35, 38.
 vii. 13—23, IV. 118, 292.
 vii. 24—29, III. 39.
 viii. 1—4, III. 206.
 viii. 5—13, III. 218, IV. 95, 98,
 124.
 viii. 14—18, III. 202.
 viii. 19—22, III. 269.
 viii. 23—27, IV. 179.
 viii. 28—34, IV. 150, 238.
 ix. 1—8, III. 213, 367.
 ix. 9—13, III. 98, 265, 362.
 ix. 14—17, IV. 37.
 ix. 18—26, IV. 163, 167.
 ix. 27—31, V. 64.
 ix. 32—34, III. 159, IV. 8.
 x. 1—42, III. 372, 393.
 x. 16—33, IV. 286, 292, 317, 319,
 V. 232, 244, 248.</p> | <p>x. 37—42, IV. 280, 320, V. 248.
 xi. 1, IV. 107.
 xi. 2—6, IV. 29, 42.
 xi. 7—15, IV. 42, 126.
 xi. 16—19, III. 362, IV. 43.
 xi. 20—24, IV. 123.
 xi. 25—30, IV. 54, 60.
 xii. 1—14, III. 363, IV. 14, 159.
 xii. 15—21, III. 158, comp. 71.
 xii. 22—37, III. 234, IV. 8.
 xii. 38—42, IV. 123.
 xii. 43—45, IV. 122.
 xii. 46—50, IV. 146.
 xiii. 1—52, IV. 129, 147, 184.
 xiii. 53—58, IV. 107.
 xiv. 1—13, IV. 216.
 xiv. 14—21, IV. 192.
 xiv. 22—33, IV. 185.
 xiv. 34—36, III. 186, IV. 212.
 xv. 1—20, IV. 17.
 xv. 21—28, IV. 88, 245.
 xv. 29—39, IV. 200.
 xvi. 1—4, IV. 13, 250.
 xvi. 5—12, IV. 250.
 xvi. 13—20, IV. 260.
 xvi. 21—23, IV. 268.
 xvi. 24—28, IV. 280.
 xvii. 1—13, IV. 305, 308.
 xvii. 14—21, IV. 321.
 xvii. 22, 23, IV. 303, 307.
 xvii. 24—27, IV. 325.
 xviii. 1—14, IV. 333, 335, III. 19.
 xviii. 15—17, IV. 338.
 xviii. 18—20, IV. 340.
 xviii. 21—35, IV. 338.</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- xix. 1, 2, V. 4, 63.
 xix. 3—12, V. 28.
 xix. 13—15, V. 26.
 xix. 16—26, V. 36.
 xix. 27—30, V. 42, 44.
 xx. 1—16, V. 45.
 xx. 17—19, V. 48.
 xx. 20—28, V. 49, 54.
 xx. 29—34, V. 61.
 xxi. 1—11, V. 89, 95, 114.
 xxi. 12—17, V. 116, 124, 126.
 xxi. 18—22, V. 133, 144.
 xxi. 23—46, V. 134, 137.
 xxii. 1—14, V. 154, 191, comp. IV. 119.
 xxii. 15—22, V. 154, 156.
 xxii. 23—33, V. 170.
 xxii. 34—40, V. 176.
 xxii. 41—46, V. 182.
 xxiii. 1—7, V. 195, 205.
 xxiii. 8—12, V. 201, 336.
 xxiii. 13—39, V. 208—221.
 xxiv. 1—51, V. 225, 242, 244, 250, 251.
 xxv. 1—12, V. 255.
 xxv. 14—30, V. 251.
 xxv. 31—46, V. 256.
 xxvi. 1, 2, V. 247.
 xxvi. 3—5, V. 282, VI. 206.
 xxvi. 6—13, V. 261.
 xxvi. 14—16, V. 286.
 xxvi. 17—19, V. 276, VI. 197.
 xxvi. 20—30, V. 310, 316.
 xxvi. 31—35, VI. 5.
 xxvi. 36—46, VI. 12.
 xxvi. 47—56, VI. 23, 29.
 xxvi. 57, 58, VI. 36, 57.
 xxvi. 59—68, VI. 40, 49, 54.
 xxvi. 69—75, VI. 59.
 xxvii. 1, 2, VI. 63.
 xxvii. 3—10, VI. 187.
 xxvii. 11—26, VI. 79—102, 116, 208.
 xxvii. 27—31, VI. 119, 123.
 xxvii. 32—38, VI. 124, 129, 150.
 xxvii. 39—44, VI. 152.
 xxvii. 45—49, VI. 166, 172.
 xxvii. 50, VI. 159.
 xxvii. 51—54, VI. 174, 178, 181.
 xxvii. 55, 56, VI. 154.
 xxvii. 57—61, VI. 257, 263.
 xxvii. 62—66, VI. 270, 308.
 xxviii. 1—10, VI. 283, 303, 308.
 xxviii. 11—15, VI. 308.
 xxviii. 16—20, VI. 368, comp. V. 338.
- LUKE.
- i. 1, I. 98, 105.
 i. 5—80, II. 70, 204.
 ii. 1—40, II. 80.
 ii. 41—52, II. 132.
 iii. 1, II. 381, VI. 219.
 iii. 1—20, II. 217, 227.
 iii. 21, 22, II. 267.
 iii. 23—38, II. 25.
 iv. 1—15, II. 300, III. 138.
 iv. 16—30, III. 21, IV. 111, 199.
 iv. 31, 32, III. 23, 137.
 iv. 33—37, III. 246.
 iv. 38—44, III. 201.
 v. 1—11, III. 261, 264, IV. 203.
 v. 12—16, III. 206.
 v. 17—26, III. 213, 367.
 v. 27—39, III. 265, 361, IV. 37, comp. III. 98.
 vi. 1—11, III. 363, IV. 14, 159.
 vi. 12—49, III. 283, 373, IV. 118, 318.
 vii. 1—10, III. 218, IV. 95.
 vii. 11—17, IV. 115, 174.
 vii. 18—23, IV. 29, 43, 174.
 vii. 24—35, IV. 43, 126.
 vii. 36—50, IV. 8, V. 268.
 viii. 1—3, IV. 107.
 viii. 4—18, IV. 129.
 viii. 19—21, IV. 146.
 viii. 22—25, IV. 179.
 viii. 26—39, IV. 150, 238.
 viii. 40—56, IV. 163, 167.
 ix. 1—6, III. 373, 393, 404.
 ix. 7—9, IV. 226.
 ix. 10—17, IV. 192, 232, 237.
 ix. 18—27, IV. 260, 268.
 ix. 28—36, IV. 308.
 ix. 37—43, IV. 321.
 ix. 43—45, IV. 307.

- ix. 46—50, IV. 334.
 ix. 51—56, V. 7, 12.
 ix. 57—62, III. 268.
 x. 1—12, I. 104, III. 396, IV. 318, V. 13—17, comp. III. 393.
 x. 13—16, IV. 320.
 x. 17—20, I. 103, III. 405.
 x. 21—24, IV. 54, 60.
 x. 25—37, III. 113, V. 12, 15, 71, 182.
 x. 38—42, I. 108, III. 151, 349, V. 87.
 xi. 1—4, III. 336.
 xi. 5—13, I. 100 n., III. 35, 110.
 xi. 14—26, IV. 9, 122.
 xi. 27, 28, III. 355, IV. 212.
 xi. 29—32, IV. 123.
 xi. 33—36, III. 29, 31.
 xi. 37—54, V. 198.
 xii. 1—12, IV. 319, comp. V. 232.
 xii. 13—34, IV. 80.
 xii. 35—40, V. 246.
 xii. 41—48, V. 246, 251.
 xii. 49—53, IV. 317.
 xii. 54, 56, IV. 13.
 xii. 57—59, III. 307.
 xiii. 1—5, IV. 120.
 xiii. 6—9, IV. 121, V. 151.
 xiii. 10—17, IV. 15, 161.
 xiii. 18—21, IV. 138, 148.
 xiii. 22—30, IV. 98, 118, V. 7.
 xiii. 31—33, IV. 229, 344.
 xiii. 34, 35, V. 216.
 xiv. 1—6, IV. 15, 162.
 xiv. 7—14, III. 123, IV. 8.
 xiv. 15—24, IV. 119.
 xiv. 25—33, IV. 318.
 xiv. 34, 35, III. 295.
 xv. 1—10, III. 99, IV. 6, 334.
 xv. 11—32, IV. 7.
 xvi. 1—13, IV. 81.
 xvi. 14—18, IV. 8.
 xvi. 19—31, I. 99, 164, IV. 81, 89 n., V. 86.
 xvii. 1—4, IV. 334, 338.
 xvii. 5—10, I. 104, IV. 323.
 xvii. 11—19, III. 163, 210, V. 7, 15.
 xvii. 20, 21, IV. 13.
 xvii. 22—37, V. 232, 248, IV. 317.
 xviii. 1—8, V. 256.
 xviii. 9—14, IV. 7.
 xviii. 15—17, V. 26.
 xviii. 18—30, V. 36, 42.
 xviii. 31—34, V. 48.
 xviii. 35—43, V. 61.
 xix. 1—10, V. 56.
 xix. 11—27, V. 65, 252.
 xix. 28—36, V. 88, 97.
 xix. 37—40, V. 67, 111.
 xix. 41—44, V. 67.
 xix. 45, 46, V. 116.
 xx. 1—8, V. 134.
 xx. 9—19, V. 139.
 xx. 20—26, V. 156.
 xx. 27—40, V. 170, 189.
 xx. 41—44, V. 184.
 xx. 45—47, V. 197.
 xxi. 1—4, V. 193.
 xxi. 5—38, V. 127, 243, 248.
 xxii. 1, 2, V. 247.
 xxii. 3—6, V. 286.
 xxii. 7—13, V. 276, VI. 197.
 xxii. 14—23, V. 305, 308—311, 315.
 xxii. 24—30, V. 335, 337.
 xxii. 31—38, VI. 4, comp. 283.
 xxii. 39—46, VI. 10, 12.
 xxii. 47—53, VI. 23.
 xxii. 54—62, VI. 36, 41, 57.
 xxii. 63—65, VI. 55.
 xxii. 66—71, VI. 63, 73.
 xxiii. 1—25, VI. 79, 102.
 xxiii. 26—32, VI. 130.
 xxiii. 33—38, VI. 155.
 xxiii. 39—43, VI. 156.
 xxiii. 44—46, VI. 158, 172.
 xxiii. 47—49, VI. 181, 186.
 xxiii. 50—54, VI. 257, 262, 265.
 xxiii. 55, 56, VI. 263, 266.
 xxiv. 1—12, VI. 283, 305.
 xxiv. 13—35, VI. 306.
 xxiv. 36—43, VI. 307.
 xxiv. 44—49, VI. 373, V. 338.
 xxiv. 50, 53, VI. 377.

MARK.

- i. 1—3, I. 123.
 i. 4—8, II. 219, 227.
 i. 9—11, II. 268.
 i. 12, 13, II. 300.
 i. 14, 15, III. 40.
 i. 16—20, III. 261.
 i. 21—28, III. 246.
 i. 29—39, III. 201.
 i. 40—45, III. 206.
 ii. 1—12, III. 213, 367.
 ii. 13—17, III. 265, 362.
 ii. 18—22, IV. 37.
 ii. 23—28, III. 363.
 iii. 1—6, IV. 14, 159.
 iii. 7—12, III. 19.
 iii. 13—19, III. 373.
 iii. 20—30, IV. 9, 110.
 iii. 31—35, IV. 110, 146.
 iv. 1—34, IV. 129.
 iv. 35—41, IV. 179.
 v. 1—20, IV. 150, 238.
 v. 21—43, IV. 163, 167.
 vi. 1—6, IV. 107.
 vi. 7—13, III. 373, 393.
 vi. 14—30, IV. 216.
 vi. 31—44, III. 404, IV. 192, 232, 236.
 vi. 45—52, IV. 188.
 vi. 53—56, III. 187, IV. 212.
 vii. 1—23, IV. 17.
 vii. 24—30, IV. 88, 245.
 vii. 31—37, I. 117, III. 184, IV. 247—249.
 viii. 1—9, IV. 200.
 viii. 10—13, IV. 238, 250.
 viii. 14—21, IV. 250.
 viii. 22—26, V. 64.
 viii. 27—ix. 1, IV. 260, 268.
 ix. 2—13, IV. 305, 308 sqq.
 ix. 14—29, IV. 321.
 ix. 30—32, IV. 307.
 ix. 33—37, IV. 333.
 ix. 38—40, IV. 304.
 ix. 41—50, IV. 320, 334 n. 2.
 x. 1—12, V. 6, 24, 28, 47.
 x. 13—16, V. 26.
 x. 17—27, V. 36.
 x. 28—31, V. 42.
 x. 32—34, V. 47.
 x. 35—40, V. 49.
 x. 41—45, V. 54.
 x. 46—52, V. 61.
 xi. 1—11, V. 89, 97.
 xi. 12—14, V. 144, 150.
 xi. 15—17, V. 116, 127.
 xi. 18, 19, V. 126.
 xi. 20—25, V. 145.
 xi. 26, IV. 334, 338.
 xi. 27—33, V. 134.
 xii. 1—12, V. 139.
 xii. 13—17, V. 156.
 xii. 18—27, V. 170.
 xii. 28—34, V. 176, 179 n. 4, 181.
 xii. 35—37, V. 184.
 xii. 38—40, V. 197.
 xii. 41—44, V. 194.
 xiii. 1—36, V. 242, 245, 249, 251.
 xiv. 1, 2, V. 247, 281.
 xiv. 3—9, V. 261.
 xiv. 10, 11, V. 286.
 xiv. 12—16, V. 276, VI. 197.
 xiv. 17—25, V. 310, 314 sqq.
 xiv. 26—31, VI. 5.
 xiv. 32—42, VI. 10 sqq.
 xiv. 43—50, VI. 23.
 xiv. 51, 52, VI. 32.
 xiv. 53, 54, VI. 36, 40, 57.
 xiv. 55—65, VI. 40, 49, 55.
 xiv. 66—72, VI. 59.
 xv. 1—5, VI. 63, 79.
 xv. 6—15, VI. 93, 99, 116.
 xv. 16—20, VI. 119.
 xv. 21—28, VI. 122, 147, 150.
 xv. 29—32, VI. 153.
 xv. 33—39, VI. 159, 172, 174, 181.
 xv. 40, 41, VI. 154.
 xv. 42—47, VI. 182, 263, 266.
 xvi. 1—8, VI. 266, 283, 304.
 xvi. 9—20, VI. 318.

JOHN.

- i. 1—18, I. 148.
 i. 19—28, II. 229, 232, 265, 301.
 i. 29—34, II. 275, 279—281.

- i. 35—43, II. 301, III. 12, 261,
270 sq., 374.
i. 44—51, II. 301 sqq., III. 270.
ii. 1—12, IV. 203 sqq.
ii. 13—25, V. 74, 117, 127, VI.
239 n. 2.
iii. 1—21, III. 26.
iii. 22—36, II. 331, V. 338.
iv. 1—42, V. 18, 73, 338.
iv. 43—54, III. 134 sq., 220.
v. 1—47, IV. 159, V. 73 sq., 210,
VI. 236.
vi. 1—15, IV. 192, 299.
vi. 16—25, IV. 184.
vi. 26—59, IV. 260, V. 341.
vi. 60—71, IV. 2, 300.
vii. 1—52, V. 74, comp. 154 n. 3,
VI. 54.
vii. 53—viii. 11, V. 165.
viii. 12—x. 21, V. 74.
viii. 37—40, V. 154 n. 3.
x. 22—42, V. 74 sq.
xi. 1—46, V. 76, 79, 272.
xi. 47—57, V. 76, 284.
xii. 1—11, V. 76, 261, 264, 272,
274, VI. 245.
xii. 12—19, V. 88, 93, 115.
xii. 20—50, V. 78, 130.
xiii. 1, I. 156, VI. 199, 245.
xiii. 1—20, V. 341.
xiii. 21—30, V. 312, VI. 2.
xiii. 31—38, VI. 5.
xiii.—xvii., V. 339, comp. I. 151 sq.
xviii. 1, 2, VI. 8, 17.
xviii. 3—11, VI. 23, 33.
xviii. 12—14, VI. 36.
xviii. 15—18, VI. 58 sq.
xviii. 19—24, VI. 77.
xviii. 25—27, VI. 60.
xviii. 28—40, VI. 79, 106, 200,
205.
xix. 1—16, VI. 107, 116, 166, 200.
xix. 17—22, VI. 116, 129, 151.
xix. 23, 24, VI. 151.
xix. 25—30, VI. 157.
xix. 31—37, VI. 176, 252.
xix. 38—42, VI. 257.
xx. 1—18, VI. 310 sq.
xx. 19—23, VI. 312.
xx. 24—29, VI. 313.
xx. 30, 31, I. 143.
xxi. 1—25, VI. 313 sqq.

GENERAL INDEX.

- Abel, V. 217 sq.
 Abgarus, I. 47.
 Abilene, II. 381, 383.
 Adulteress, the, V. 165.
 Adultery, III. 307.
 Advent, second, IV. 283, 288, V. 260.
 Agrippa I., I. 272, 275, II. 394, VI. 121.
 Alexandria, I. 279, VI. 121.
 Alphæus (Clopas), III. 274, 276, 391, VI. 306.
 Andrew, III. 261, 387, IV. 193, V. 243 n.
 Anna, II. 82.
 Annas, VI. 36.
 Anointing, V. 262.
 Apostles, Twelve, the, III. 369, 380, 383, 387, 393, V. 13, 43, VI. 31.
 Antipas (Herod), I. 269, II. 333, 340, 392, IV. 217, VI. 103.
 Antipater, father of Herod the Great, I. 234; son, 250.
 Antonius, I. 237.
 Apocryphal Gospels, I. 34.
 Archelaus, I. 253.
 Ascension of Jesus, VI. 365.
 Ass, V. 105.
 Augustus, I. 238, 263.
 Banus, II. 218, VI. 264 n.
 Baptism, II. 238, 240, 242; of Jesus, 266. (Mode of baptism, Acts viii. 38; Pas. Herm. 9, 16.)
 Baptism, was it instituted by Jesus? II. 376, III. 342, V. 338, VI. 369.
 Barabba, VI. 94, 96.
 Bartholomew, III. 270, 272, 381.
 Bartimeus, V. 61.
 Beatitudes, III. 291.
 Beelzebul, III. 230, IV. 9, 150.
 Bernice or Veronica, IV. 163 n. 2, VI. 112, 130.
 Bethabara, V. 79 n. 2.
 Bethany, V. 72, 79, 88, 133, 153, 247, 261, 269; in Peræa, 79.
 Bethesda (Bethzatha), V. 75.
 Bethlehem, II. 101.
 Bethphage, V. 72, 89, 90.
 Bethsaida, II. 364, 367, III. 143, IV. 192, 232, 251, V. 64.
 Brethren of Jesus, II. 143, IV. 110.
 Cæsar, I. 234.
 Cæsareæ (by the sea), I. 240, 243, 275 n. 1.
 Cæsarea Philippi, I. 274, IV. 251, 256, 260, 299.
 Caiaphas, I. 266, 268, V. 282, VI. 36, 49, 226.
 Caligula, I. 307.
 Cana, IV. 116, 204, 206.
 Capernaum, II. 347, 354, 356, III. 137.
 Carabas of Alexandria, VI. 121.
 Carus, II. 79 (comp. *Jos. Ant.* 17, 2, 4).
 Celibacy, II. 197, III. 120, V. 32.

- Celsus, I. 30.
 Census, I. 260, II. 80, 104, 116, V. 161.
 Centurion, III. 218.
 Chorazin, II. 367, III. 143.
 Christmas-day, II. 126.
 Chronology of Jesus's birth, II. 109 ; first public appearance, 379 ; death, VI. 193.
 Circumcision, II. 81, 97, 207.
 Cockerowing, VI. 7, 60.
 Community, the, of Jesus, IV. 265, 332.
 Community of goods, III. 346.
 Confession of sins, II. 245.
 Conflicts, mental, of Jesus, VI. 12.
 Cross, the, VI. 124, 138, 142.
 Crucifixion, mode of, VI. 138, 145, 168 ; day of Jesus's, 193 ; year, 219.
 Dalmanutha, IV. 238.
 Daniel, Book of, I. 317, 320, III. 44, IV. 288, V. 234, VI. 52.
 Darkness at noon, VI. 172.
 Davidic descent of Jesus, II. 26, 41, V. 184.
 Death, apparent, IV. 171 n., VI. 326.
 Decapolis, IV. 247.
 Devil, I. 99, II. 304, 312, 316, III. 226.
 Disciples, calling of, III. 250, 369, 383.
 Divorce, III. 308, V. 28.
 Dove, the, as a symbol, II. 279, 280, 286.
 Dysmas, VI. 156.
 Earthquake at crucifixion, VI. 178, 308.
 Ebionites, Gospel of the, I. 43, 98.
 Ecce Homo, VI. 108.
 Egypt, flight into, II. 90 ; Jews in, I. 278.
 Egyptians, Gospel of the, I. 44.
 Eli, Eli, VI. 159.
 Elijah, III. 255, IV. 125, 227, 233, 261, 305, 308, 315.
 Elizabeth, II. 204.
 Emmaus, VI. 306.
 Enthusiasm, religious, VI. 348.
 Ephraim, V. 9, 74, 77.
 Epilepsy, IV. 322.
 Esoteric teaching of Jesus, III. 281, VI. 376.
 Essenes, I. 365, III. 345.
 Ethnarch, I. 258 (comp. 1 Macc. xiv. 47 ; Jos. *Ant.* 13, 6, 7 ; 14, 7, 2 ; 14, 8, 5 ; 19, 5, 2 ; 2 Cor. xi. 32).
 Farewell addresses, V. 225.
 Fasting, IV. 39.
 Feasts, I. 303, 313 ; trial and execution at, VI. 206—208.
 Feet-washing, V. 339, 341.
 Fig-tree, V. 144, 146, 148.
 Fishing, III. 263 ; fish-miracles, IV. 203, 329, VI. 315.
 Flaccus, II. 396, VI. 231 n.
 Forgiveness, IV. 338.
 Gabbatha, VI. 84—86.
 Gabinius, I. 235.
 Gadara, IV. 150, 157, 238.
 Galilee, II. 1, 23, 348, III. 134, IV. 116, 245 ; attitude of people of, to Jesus, IV. 42, 106.
 Gamaliel, I. 298, VI. 264 n.
 Gaulanitis, IV. 237.
 Geminus, VI. 221.
 Gennesaret, Lake of, II. 358, 363, IV. 238.
 Gestas, VI. 156.
 Gethsemane, VI. 2, 9.
 God, doctrine of, III. 48, 66, IV. 70.
 Golgotha, VI. 132.
 Healings, III. 171, 223, IV. 149 ; attempt by disciples, 322.
 Heathen, the, IV. 84 ; religion and morality of, III. 70, 116.
 Hebrews, Gospel of the, I. 40.
 Hell, descent into, VI. 179, 340. (Comp. also Test. Lev. 4. In

- Past. Herm. and Clem. Strom. 6, 6, 45 sq., mention is made chiefly of the descent of the Apostles into hell. Clement thinks it possible that Jesus converted the Jews, the Apostles the heathen.)
- Hellenes, V. 130.
- Hellenism, I. 237, 261, III. 70.
- Herod the Great, I. 234; palace, VI. 80; temple, I. 242, 253.
- Herodians, IV. 230, V. 157.
- Herodias, II. 332, 341, 390, IV. 217.
- Hillel, I. 349, V. 178.
- Hosanna, V. 108, 124.
- Idumæa, I. 234, III. 351 (the barbarians of this country, see Jos. *B.J.* 4, 41 sqq., as hearers of Jesus, Mark iii. 8).
- Immortality, IV. 283.
- Ituræa, II. 383.
- Jacob's Well, V. 18.
- Jairus, IV. 168.
- James, brother of Jesus, I. 16, II. 144, IV. 113, VI. 293, 320.
- James, the Gospel of, I. 46.
- James the Less, III. 391.
- Jansenists, crucifixion-tortures among, VI. 329.
- Jericho, II. 232, 234, V. 21, 47, 56, 59, 71.
- Jerusalem, entry into, V. 96, 105; the city, 110; lamentation over, 220; the Romanizing of, I. 244.
- Jesus. His home, II. 22; his parents, 24; lineage, 25; the question of his birth, 39; the legend of the childhood, 68; the name Jesus, 97; place and time of birth, 101; the school, 131, 149; the bringing up, 146; did he read the Scripture in the Hebrew or the Greek? 152; the synagogue, 154; Jesus's person and character, 166; his relations with John, 269, 272; his baptism, 266, 279; moment of consciousness of his mission, 292; retirement to the wilderness, 300; temptation, 304; at Capernaum, 347, 376; the year in which he commenced his work, and the duration of that work, 381; the Galilean spring-time, III. 10; the first preaching, 12; the kingdom of heaven, 39, 48, 74; righteousness, 65; Fatherhood of God, 66; Son of Man, 79; repentance, 92; the relation of Jesus's teaching to secular things, 121; the method of Jesus, 122; parables, 126, IV. 127; localities in which he preached, III. 134; miracles—critical difficulties, 155; Jesus's private life, 336; the belief of the people and opposition of the leaders, 350, IV. 4; conflicts and disillusion, IV. 1; Jesus and the Baptist's disciples, 27; the tetrarch and Jesus, 227; the journey to the feast, V. 1; the entry into Jerusalem, 65; the decisive struggle, 132; cause of his death, VI. 170; Jesus's contribution to religion, 390; what he was, 402; his place in history, 425.
- Jews, political condition, I. 233; religious, 276, 293; moral, 312.
- Joanna, III. 275, VI. 305.
- John and James, sons of Zebedee, I. 214, III. 261, 387, V. 12, 49, VI. 315.
- John, Gospel of, I. 141.
- John the Presbyter, I. 219, III. 274, V. 53 n. 2, VI. 217.
- John the Baptist, II. 201; his antecedents, 204; youth, 213; his mission, 217; the preacher in the wilderness, 227; the call to repent, 236; his conception of repentance thoroughly moral, 238; baptism, 240; confession

- of sins, 245; the kingdom of God, 246; the crowds in the wilderness, 254; at Machærus, 329; his disciples, IV. 27; death, 215.
- Jordan, the, II. 231, 234, IV. 253, V. 5, 21.
- Joseph of Arimathea, III. 274, V. 273, VI. 93, 257, 263, 322.
- Joseph, husband of Mary, II. 23, 143; death, I. 47, II. 148, 195.
- Josephus, I. 16.
- Judea, V. 21.
- Judas of Galilee, I. 261, II. 259, V. 161.
- Judas (of James), III. 380, 391.
- Judas Iscariot, III. 270, 276, 392, V. 286, 295, 308, 312, 315, VI. 2, 23, 187.
- Justus of Tiberias, IV. 214 n.
- Kidron, VI. 2.
- Kingdom of heaven, II. 246, III. 42, IV. 51.
- Lance-thrust, VI. 176, 252.
- Last judgment, IV. 292, V. 256.
- Law, the, attitude of Jesus towards, III. 113, 297, 305, 322.
- Lazarus, V. 80, 272.
- Leprosy, III. 206.
- Locusts and wild honey, II. 221 n.
- Lord's Prayer, the, III. 337.
- Lucian, I. 29.
- Luke, Gospel of, I. 95.
- Lysanias, II. 383.
- Machærus, II. 329, 335, IV. 215.
- Magi, the, II. 82, 85.
- Malchus, VI. 29.
- Mammon, III. 31.
- Marriage, III. 119, V. 32.
- Mariamne, I. 237, 250.
- Mark, Gospel of, I. 114.
- Mary and Martha, III. 275, 349, V. 80, 272.
- Mary Magdalene, III. 275, V. 269, VI. 154, 265, 303, 310.
- Mary, mother of James, III. 275, VI. 154, 303.
- Mary, mother of Jesus, II. 23, 35, III. 111, VI. 132, 153, 157.
- Matthew, or Levi, III. 265, 380; Gospel of, I. 62.
- Messiah, expectation of, I. 314, 346, IV. 260, V. 123; Jesus claims to be, IV. 52; recognition at Jerusalem, V. 93.
- Messianic movement in Samaria, II. 259, 334.
- Messianism, Jesus's, V. 69, 100, 183, 187.
- Miracles of Jesus, III. 155, 170, 188; healing the sick, 197; the possessed, 226.
- Moral teaching of Jesus, III. 93, 118.
- Mount, Sermon on the, III. 18, 281, 288.
- Mustard, IV. 148.
- Nain, IV. 115, 174.
- Nathanael, III. 272, 381, VI. 315.
- Nature-miracles, IV. 178, 180.
- Nazara, II. 15, III. 22, IV. 109. (Present inhabitants, 6000. The old word Nazara also in Origen on John, X. 14 and in X. 9 Huet.; evidently therefore X. 15 (ετ) is a correction. Godet, *Luk.* 1871, I. p. 48, recognizes Nazara. Against Furrer's derivation from Nezirah, Hitzig, *Heid. Jahrb.* 1871, 4. While the language of the Talmud favours Nozerah (Nozeri, ben Nezer, hitnazzar), on the other hand the old-attested Ναζωραῖος would rather suggest the adj. verb. nazor, Nezorah, comp. Nachor, Deborah; also adom, ashok, bachon, gadol, jagor, rachok, see Gesenius, *Lehrg.* § 120, 3, *Gramm.* 83, 3).
- New birth, III. 93, 105.
- Nicodemus, III. 274, VI. 112, 263.

Nisan, VI. 196, 207.

Numenius, I. 30.

Oaths, III. 311, V. 211.

Olives, Mount of, V. 89, 110, 113, 225, VI. 9.

Onias, I. 377.

Palingenesis, V. 43.

Palm Sunday, VI. 247.

Panthera, I. 32, II. 77.

Papias, I. 39, 219.

Passion, announcement of, IV. 268, 298, 307, V. 48, 247, 322.

Passover, the, I. 303, V. 275, 300, 303, 305, 317, VI. 196, 240.

Paul, I. 48; his account of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus, VI. 279, 287, &c.

Peræa, I. 258, II. 335, V. 4, 8, 239.

Peter, III. 261, 265, 380, 383, IV. 261, 264, 340, V. 42, VI. 5, 57, 59, 315, 316 n., 317.

Petronius, I. 309, II. 389 n.

Pharisees, I. 252, 329, III. 301; Jesus's opposition to, III. 302, V. 195; opposition of Pharisees to Jesus, III. 357, 361, IV. 4, V. 283.

Philhellenes, I. 277, 297.

Philip (Apostle), III. 271, 385 n., 390 n.

Philip (Herod), I. 258, 274.

Philo, I. 15, 276.

Phlegon, I. 30, VI. 172, 173 n., 220, 224.

Pilate, Pontius, I. 265 sq., 305, II. 225, 400, VI. 83, 183, 185, 226; Pilate's wife, I. 84, VI. 100, 113, 185.

Pilate-literature, I. 46, VI. 111, 183, 321.

Pliny, I. 28.

Posca (soldiers' drink offered to Jesus on the cross), VI. 162.

Pompey, I. 235.

Possession, demoniacal, III. 179, 226, 234, IV. 150.

Poverty, IV. 79.

Prayer, III. 333, 336.

Preparation, the day of, VI. 200.

Priests' robes, VI. 53 n. 1.

Procurators, I. 260, 264, II. 223.

Publicans, the, III. 266, 361.

Quirinius, I. 260, II. 116.

Rabbi, I. 357, III. 15, V. 206, 337.

Rabboni, V. 61, VI. 311.

Religion in the Holy Land, I. 296, III. 72, 115.

Religion of Jesus, III. 48, 65, IV. 70, VI. 389.

Religion of the Old Testament, III. 72, 115, 322.

Repentance, III. 92.

Resurrection, IV. 294, V. 170; miracles of, IV. 175.

Resurrection of Jesus, IV. 282, VI. 276; the facts, 281; the myths, 302; explanation of the facts, 323.

Righteousness, III. 63, 108.

Sabbath, I. 303 sq., 371, III. 363, VI. 207, 209.

Sadducees, I. 353, IV. 230, V. 158, 170, 284.

Salt, III. 295, IV. 338 n. (not in the sense of manure, see Winer).

Salome (Herod's sister), I. 250; (Zebedee's wife), III. 262, 275, V. 2, 50, VI. 154, 304.

Samaria, Samaritan, II. 259, 334, V. 3, 7, 11, 15, 18, 71.

Sanhedrim, I. 246, V. 134, VI. 42, 64, 67, 69.

School, was Jesus taught at a, II. 149.

Scourging, VI. 116 (modifies view in IV. 275 n.).

Scribes, I. 332, III. 328, 358.

Sepulchre, the Lord's, VI. 250, 261.

Sepulture, mode of, VI. 261, 266.

- Seventy disciples, the, III. 273, V. 11, 13.
 Shammai, I. 346, 350, III. 309.
 Sidon, IV. 245.
 Simon of Cyrene, VI. 129, 206, 214.
 Simon the leper, V. 261.
 Sin, III. 93.
 Sinlessness of Jesus, VI. 405.
 Solomon's Porch, V. 192.
 Son of Man, the title, III. 79, IV. 67, 71, 73.
 Sonship, divine, III. 66, IV. 56, 67.
 Sources of History of Jesus—Jewish, I. 12; Heathen, 24; Christian, 34; Paul, 48; Gospels—Matthew, 62; Luke, 95; Mark, 114; John, 141.
 Star in the East, II. 83, 85, 111.
 Suetonius, I. 27.
 Supper, the Last, V. 275, 303, VI. 198.
 Susanna, III. 275.
 Sychar, V. 18.
 Synagogues, II. 155, III. 22, 146.
 Syria, I. 256, 259, 368, III. 16 (on Matt. iv. 24, comp. IV. 245).
 Tacitus, I. 26, VI. 384.
 Talent, IV. 339.
 Talmud, I. 21.
 Telhum (Capernaum?), II. 369, III. 142 n.
 Temple, I. 242, II. 133, V. 110, 113, 116, 225; purification of, 116; temple guard, 299, VI. 3, 23; temple tribute, IV. 325; treasury, V. 193; veil rent, VI. 174; destruction of temple, V. 226.
 Temptation of Jesus, II. 304.
 Thallus, VI. 173 n., 224 n.
 Therapeutæ, Egyptian, I. 384, II. 218, 221.
 Thomas, III. 270, 390, V. 80, VI. 310, 313, 315.
 Thomas, Gospel of, I. 46.
 Tiberias, I. 270, III. 145.
 Tiberius, I. 265, VI. 141, 184, 219, 225.
 Toledo, I. 23 n., II. 273, 332.
 Transfiguration, the, IV. 308.
 Tribute, IV. 325.
 Tyre and Sidon, IV. 245.
 Visions, not consistent with spirit of life of Jesus, IV. 311.
 Vision-theory of Jesus's resurrection, VI. 331.
 Vitellius, I. 268, II. 386, 389.
 Voices from heaven, II. 281.
 Wilderness of Judæa, II. 219.
 "Woe," V. 198, 208, 215.
 Women, followers of Jesus, III. 275, V. 2, VI. 154.
 Zacchæus, V. 56.
 Zaddikim ("the Righteous"), I. 355.
 Zechariah, son of Baruch, V. 218.

CORRECTIONS.

- I. p. 23, line 18, for "Fire-arms" read "Fiery Darts."
- „ p. 235, line 15 in note, for "Gabinus" read "Gabinus."
- II. p. 6, lines 5, 7, read "German square miles."
- III. p. 159, lines 4 and 5 from below, read "miracles and on the journey through Jericho; he has a dumb," &c.
- „ p. 201, line 7 from below, insert ³ after disciple.
- „ p. 230, line 8, and in the context, instead of "Beelzebub" read "Beelzebul."
- IV. p. 5, line 8, for "defensive" read "offensive."
- „ p. 260, in note 3, for "Luke ix. 8" read "Luke ix. 18."
- V. p. 84, line 5, for "the woman whom Jesus anointed," read "the woman who anointed Jesus."
- „ p. 128, line 2, for "Mark and Luke" read "Matthew and Luke."
- „ p. 196, line 1, for "Thursday" read "Tuesday."
- „ p. 203, line 4, „ „ „
- „ p. 222, line 2, „ „ „
- „ p. 240, line 20, for "detail" read "details."
- „ p. 257, line 4 in note, for "Rom." read "1 Cor."
- „ p. 265, line 1 in note, for "Phædrus" read "Phædo."
- „ p. 321, line 3 in note, for "Capernaumite" read "Capernaitic."
- VI. p. 20, line 2, for "Son of John" read "Son of God."
- „ p. 127, line 4 in note from below, for "portem" read "portam."
- „ p. 206, line 3 in note from below, for "xxv." read "xxvi."

Date Due

NOV 1			
NOV 2			
NOV 3			
NOV 4			
NOV 5			
NOV 6			
NOV 7			
NOV 8			
NOV 9			
NOV 10			
NOV 11			
NOV 12			
NOV 13			
NOV 14			
NOV 15			
NOV 16			
NOV 17			
NOV 18			
NOV 19			
NOV 20			
NOV 21			
NOV 22			
NOV 23			
NOV 24			
NOV 25			
NOV 26			
NOV 27			
NOV 28			
NOV 29			
NOV 30			
DEC 1			
DEC 2			
DEC 3			
DEC 4			
DEC 5			
DEC 6			
DEC 7			
DEC 8			
DEC 9			
DEC 10			
DEC 11			
DEC 12			
DEC 13			
DEC 14			
DEC 15			
DEC 16			
DEC 17			
DEC 18			
DEC 19			
DEC 20			
DEC 21			
DEC 22			
DEC 23			
DEC 24			
DEC 25			
DEC 26			
DEC 27			
DEC 28			
DEC 29			
DEC 30			
DEC 31			



BS2420 .K278 v.6
The history of Jesus of Nazara, freely

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00164 0509